DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 792 JC 850 426

AUTHOR	Campbell, William E.; Smith, Marilynn P.
TITLE	Current Student Survey Report. Part 1: Student Evaluation of Montgomery College; Part 2: Educational Goals and Reasons for Attending Montgomery College; Part 3: Student Preferences on Class Scheduling; Part 4: Communicating with Students about Montgomery College; [and] Part 5: Demographics of Students Attending Montgomery College.
INSTITUTION	Montgomery Coll., Rockville, Md. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE	85
NOTE	238p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Choice; Community Colleges; Educational Assessment; Institutional Evaluation; Needs Assessment; Participant Satisfaction; Questionnaires; *Scheduling; School Surveys; *Student Attitudes; *Student Characteristics; *Student Educational Objectives; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS	Montgomery College MD

ABSTRACT

This five-volume study report presents the methods and findings of a fall 1983 survey of current students at Montgomery College (MC). Part 1 focuses on students' evaluation of college activities, services, and facilities; perceptions regarding the difficulty of their course work and the accuracy of final grades; assessment of the college catalog and class schedule; and rating of college goals. Part 2 looks at the educational goals of MC students and their reasons for choosing and attending the college. In part 3, student responses concerning most and least convenient times for classes, preferred schedules, and interest in telecourses are analyzed by campus, by full-/part-time status, by racial/ethnic status, by credits transferred, by residence, and by sex. Part 4 provides the following information concerning MC students: knowledge about MC, television channels and radio stations watched/listened to by respondents, time of television viewing/radio listening, perceptions regarding the need for student photo identification cards, and information needs. Finally, part 5 provides information on student demographics, focusing on education completed, employment status, type of work, household income, sources of money for college, time at current address, and commuting patterns. The questionnaire is included. (LAL)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED259792

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Current Student Survey Report

Part 1: Student Evaluation of Montgomery College
Part 2: Educational Goals and Reasons for Attending Montgomery College
Part 3: Student Preferences on Class Scheduling
Part 4: Communicating with Students About Montgomery College
Part 5: Demographics of Students Attending Montgomery College

William E. Campbell, Director
Marilynn P. Smith, Administrative Assistant
Office of Institutional Research

Montgomery College
Office of Institutional Research
Montgomery County, Maryland
1985

JC 850 426

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W. E. Campbell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY REPORT
PART 1: STUDENT EVALUATION OF MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

January 1985

Office of Institutional Research
William E. Campbell, Director
Kathy Rose, Research Analyst II
Marcia Scott, Research Analyst I
Marilynn P. Smith, Administrative Associate

RECEIVED
JAN 29 1984
Montgomery Community College
Office of Institutional Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Executive Summary iii

List of Tables. ix

Introduction. 1

  Comparison of Questionnaire Respondents with All Fall 1983 Students 3

A - Student Evaluation of College Activities, Services and Facilities. 7

  1 - Quality of Instruction. 8

  2 - Helpfulness of Instructors. 9

  3 - Courtesy of Instructors 10

  4 - Availability of Instructors 11

  5 - Course Availability 12

  6 - Courtesy of Administrators and Staff. 13

  7 - Admissions: Application Processing. 14

  8 - Registration: Processing Course Requests. 15

  9 - Cashier Processing of Tuition and Fee Payments. 16

  10 - Counseling and Advising. 17

  11 - Assessment Testing 18

  12 - Reading, Writing and Language Skills Programs 20

  13 - Reading and Writing Center 21

  14 - Math Skills Improvement Program. 22

  15 - Math Skills Centers. 23

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

16 - Library Services. 24

17 - Condition of the Library Facilities 25

18 - Financial Aid 26

19 - Job Placement Assistance. 27

20 - Physical Condition of Classrooms. 28

21 - Parking Lot (Space Availability). 29

22 - Security. 30

23 - Child Care Center 31

24 - Condition of the Bookstores 32

25 - Laboratories. 33

26 - Cafeterias. 34

27 - Social/Recreational Facilities. 35

28 - Athletic Facilities 36

B - Student Evaluations of Course Work and Grades

1 - The Difficulty of Course Work 37

2 - The Accuracy of Final Grades. 38

C - Student Evaluations of College Publications

1 - The College Catalog. 39

2 - Usefulness of Class Schedule Publication 39

D - Student Rating of College Goals. 40

E - Summary. 42

5

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Title:	Current Student Survey Report Part 1: Student Evaluation of Montgomery College
Purpose:	This report presents the data obtained from students enrolled at Montgomery College during the fall 1983 semester on the following subjects: evaluation of College activities, services and facilities; the difficulty of course work and the perceived accuracy of grades; accuracy and usefulness of the College catalog and class schedule publications; and attitude toward College goals. Comparisons are made of the evaluations given by all respondents and by students grouped by campus, by full-time and part-time status, by time of class attendance, by sex, by racial and ethnic status, by residence, and by credits transferred to Montgomery College to determine variations among subgroups.
Methodology:	All students enrolled in credit courses were sent a questionnaire in November, 1983, and those not responding were sent a follow-up questionnaire. The response rate was 35.7 percent of the student body (7,254/20,314). The respondents are proportionally representative of the fall student body on the following key variables: campus, full-time/part-time status, time of class attendance, residence, and credits transferred to Montgomery College. The variables in which differences occur are age, sex and minority status. Students under 30 years of age, males, and minorities (Asian, Black and Hispanic students) are slightly underrepresented in the respondents. In the analysis of the evaluations of College activities and facilities, those students rating an item excellent or good have been combined into the satisfied group. The focus of discussion is on variations in "satisfied," "fair" and "poor" ratings. Tests of statistical significance were done on these variations, and those that reach the .01 or .05 level of confidence are reported.

Limitations: Each questionnaire was labelled with the student's name. Despite assurances of confidentiality, this may have affected the response rate and the candor of the respondents, especially since final grades had not been issued at the time the students received the questionnaire.

Males, younger students, and minorities are somewhat underrepresented in the respondents. An analysis of the data on the basis of sex revealed very few differences between males and females. Minority students tended to be somewhat less satisfied than nonminorities, and so the total College evaluations might have been less positive if minority students had been a larger proportion of the respondents. The data were not analyzed by age group. Therefore, the effect of the underrepresentation of younger students is unknown.

Statistical significance does not necessarily imply practical significance or importance. Small differences between large groups, groups of 1,000 individuals or more, easily reach statistical significance. This is the case for many of the comparisons, and so a five percent difference is statistically significant. Such a difference, however, may not always have practical significance.

Findings: Overall, the student evaluations are very favorable. A large majority of respondents gave excellent or good ratings to every item evaluated, except parking and the cafeterias. The percentage of excellent plus good ratings on all items range from a high of 92 percent for the physical facility of the library to a low of only 44 percent for parking space availability.

The items which received the highest ratings overall, with 80 percent or more of the student evaluators considering them excellent or good are: quality of instruction, courtesy of instructors, helpfulness of instructors, library services and facilities, athletic facilities, child care centers, language skills programs and centers, and math skills programs and centers.

Items which were rated excellent or good by 70-79 percent of the respondents are: availability of instructors, course availability, courtesy of administrators and staff, laboratory facilities, security, admissions, registration, cashier processing, assessment testing, financial aid, and the physical condition of the classrooms.

Those which were rated excellent or good by 60-69 percent of the students are: the bookstores, social and recreational facilities, counseling/advising, and job placement. Only 52 percent of the students considered the cafeterias to be excellent or good.

Variations in Ratings by Campus: Germantown students were more satisfied than were students on the other campuses or off-campus students. In many cases the differences are small, but the pattern of greater satisfaction is quite consistent. Items which are rated more highly by a significantly larger percentage of Germantown students include: helpfulness of instructors, courtesy of instructors, courtesy of administrators and staff, admissions, registration, cashier processing of tuition and fee payments, counseling and advising, job placement, the physical condition of the library, the physical condition of the classrooms, parking lot space availability, the laboratories, the cafeteria, the social and recreational facilities, the athletic facilities, security, and the child care center. Also, a larger percentage of Germantown students considered their final grades to be an accurate reflection of their knowledge and performance of course work. Germantown students were, however, less pleased with course availability than the College norm.

Students enrolled at Rockville were less satisfied than those at Germantown and Takoma Park with assessment testing, counseling/advising, the courtesy of administrators and staff, and the physical condition of the laboratories. The physical condition of the classrooms and the space availability of parking were rated considerably lower by Rockville students. A majority of respondents rated the cafeteria as fair or poor.

Takoma Park students rated the financial aid program and the bookstore more highly than did students on the other campuses. However, they rated the library services and facility and the social and recreational facilities less positively. A majority rated the cafeteria as fair or poor.

Off-campus students were somewhat less satisfied with the quality of instruction, the availability of instructors, and the condition of the classrooms than the on-campus students.

Variations in Ratings by Minority Students: Generally, the differences were in the direction of lesser satisfaction, but Asian, Black and Hispanic students did not always agree in their evaluations. As a whole, minority students were less satisfied than nonminorities with the cafeteria, athletic facilities, social and recreational facilities, child care facilities, and security. They were more satisfied with the financial aid program.

Asian students tended to be less satisfied than Black or Hispanic students. They rated the quality of instruction and the helpfulness and availability of instructors significantly below the College norm. They also were less satisfied with the courtesy of instructors, administrators and staff. However, they were more satisfied with course availability and counseling and advising. Both Black and Asian students were less satisfied than the Hispanic students with the job placement program.

Black students, like the Asian students, were less satisfied than students in general with the helpfulness, availability and courtesy of instructors, but their ratings of these items were higher than those of the Asian students. Black students were the least likely to feel that their grades were accurate. They were more satisfied with counseling and advising.

Hispanics tended to be the most satisfied of the minority students. Their evaluations of helpfulness, availability and courtesy of instructors, of the quality of instruction were as positive or more positive than the College norm. They were more pleased than the other minorities with the job placement program and had the highest percentage of students satisfied with financial aid.

Males and Females: Eighty-seven percent of the females considered their final grades to be accurate, while only 81 percent of the males considered them accurate, the only significant difference in evaluations by men and women.

Full-time and Part-time Students: Three statistically significant differences were found. Full-time students were less satisfied with assessment testing, the physical condition of the library, and accuracy of grades.

Residence: Montgomery County, Maryland, and Nonresident: The only significant difference among these students was in the evaluation of cashier processing of tuition and fees. Nonresident students were less satisfied than the College norm.

Day, Evening and Day/Evening: Day students were less satisfied with assessment testing and parking and were more satisfied with the physical condition of the laboratories. Evening students were less satisfied with the quality of instruction, counseling/advising, the child care facilities and the physical condition of classrooms and laboratories. Evening students were more satisfied with parking and with the accuracy of final grades. Students attending classes both in the day and evening were less satisfied with course availability, instructor availability, assessment testing and with a cafeteria.

Students Transferring Credits to Montgomery College: Tranfer students were more satisfied than students in general with the accuracy of grades and with the condition of laboratories. They were less satisfied with the job placement program and with the social and recreational facilities of the College.

All Respondents:

Most students (72%) found the course work at the College to be about as difficult as they had expected, and of those that had received their final grades, 84 percent felt they were accurate. Over 90 percent of the respondents considered the course descriptions in the College catalog to be accurate and the class schedule publication to be useful. All of the College goals listed received widespread support by large majorities of all students.

Recommendations: Overall, the evaluations of the College by these students enrolled in fall 1983 are quite reassuring. It appears that for the most part, the experience of these students has been positive. However, the findings reported here rather clearly suggest some areas that may need improvement.

Instead of including a list of general recommendations here, we are postponing the recommendations for a future report. The reason for this is that a great many respondents wrote quite specific and detailed reasons for their dissatisfactions. This voluminous information is still being recorded and will be the subject of a future report. We feel that making recommendations at this point is premature. However, the findings in this report provide some basic information on student satisfactions and dissatisfactions with Montgomery College.

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

1 - Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students. 5

2 - Quality of Instruction. 8

3 - Helpfulness of Instructors. 9

4 - Courtesy of Instructors 10

5 - Availability of Instructors 11

6 - Course Availability 12

7 - Courtesy of Administrators and Staff. 13

8 - Admissions: Application Processing. 14

9 - Registration: Processing Course Requests. 15

10 - Cashier Processing of Tuition/Fee Payments. . . . 16

11 - Counseling and Advising 18

12 - Assessment Testing. 19

13 - Reading, Writing & Language Skills Programs . . . 20

14 - Reading and Writing Centers 21

15 - Math Skills Improvement Program 22

16 - Math Skill Centers. 23

17 - Library Services. 24

18 - Condition of the Library Facilities 25

19 - Financial Aid 26

20 - Job Placement Assistance. 27

21 - Physical Condition of the Classrooms. 28

22 - Parking Lot Space Availability. 29

23 - Security. 30

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

24 - Social/Recreational Facilities. 31

25 - Condition of the Bookstore. 32

26 - Laboratories. 33

27 - Cafeterias. 34

28 - Social/Recreational Facilities. 35

29 - Athletic Facilities 36

30 - Difficulty of Course Work 37

31 - Accuracy of Final Grades. 38

32 - Accuracy of College Catalog 39

33 - Usefulness of Class Schedule Publication 39

34 - Rating of College Goals 40

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The Current Student Survey is one of five components of a Community Assessment Program study being conducted by the College's Office of Institutional Research. The purpose of the Current Student Survey is to find out from currently enrolled students their opinions on the quality of College programs, services and facilities; their perception and knowledge of the College; their educational goals and expectations; their preferences on class scheduling; their use of the media; and a number of demographic factors. The data will be used to determine how well the College is meeting the educational needs of the students and how to better communicate with the students.

The reports on the Current Student Survey will be issued in several parts based on the following topics:

1. Student Evaluation of Montgomery College
2. Educational Goals and Reasons for Attending MC
3. Knowledge about Montgomery College
4. Media Use
5. Preferences on Class Scheduling
6. Demographics
7. Open-ended responses

It was thought important to find out if there are differences in the opinions and needs of several subgroups of the student population. Therefore, the data obtained will be analyzed so as to compare the responses of the following student groups: students enrolled at the different campuses and at off-campus locations; students attending in the day, evening and day/evening; students enrolled full-time and part-time; males and females; Asian, Black, and Hispanic students; students who have transferred to Montgomery College; and Montgomery County residents, Maryland residents, and nonresidents.

Methodology

In the fall semester of 1983, 20,314 students were enrolled in credit courses on all three campuses and at off-campus locations. All students were sent a questionnaire during the month of November, 1983, and those not responding were sent a follow-up questionnaire. Seven thousand two hundred and fifty-four (7,254) completed questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate of 35.7 percent of the student body (7254/20314).

Since no question on the questionnaire was answered by all respondents, the number (N) of student respondents will differ somewhat for each question. The total College N will not equal that of all students identified by campus, as about 200 students tore off the identifying label on the questionnaire. These are included only in the total College N.

Chi square was used to test the statistical significance of the difference among the groups. Two levels of comparence ($p <.01$ and $p <.05$) were established for the groups depending on size. A five percent difference between groups of students consisting of approximately 1,000 individuals or more, as in the case of students divided by campus, is statistically significant at the .01 level. This means that we can be fairly certain that a five percent difference found is not by chance, and that there is a real however small difference between groups. Most of the comparisons done in this study are among groups of this size or larger. Thus a five percent difference will be statistically significant for most comparisons.

Larger differences are needed to reach statistical significance when comparing smaller groups of students. Groups consisting of about 400 individuals in our study are Asians, Blacks, transfers, and off-campus students. For these comparisons, about a ten percent difference is needed to reach statistical significance at the .01 level of confidence and an eight percent difference for the .05 level of confidence. Even greater differences are necessary for smaller groups included here such as Hispanics, and nonresidents.

Differences reported as statistically significant may of course, have little practical significance. Practical significance, or the importance of the differences, is left to the judgement of the reader.

A Comparison of Questionnaire Respondents with All Fall 1983 Students

To ascertain the representativeness of the respondents to the total student body, comparisons of respondents and the total student population on key variables were made. Information on the total student population is taken from the OIR publication, entitled, "Profile of Students Enrolled at MC during Fall Semester of 1983", and from internal records of the College. Comparison of the respondents and the fall 1983 student body on the variables of campus, full-time/part-time status, time of class attendance, residence and transfer status revealed no significant differences between groups. The percentage of respondents falling into these subgroups parallels that of the total student body. There were, however, some differences on age, sex, and minority status.

Age

The respondents are a little older than the student body in general. Based on adjusted percentages, 62 percent of the respondents as compared to 70 percent of the fall 1983 student body were under 30 years of age. The biggest discrepancy is in the 20-29 age group, which is underrepresented by five percent in our respondents. This underrepresentation of younger students is similar for all campuses, and is a statistically significant difference.

Sex

Using adjusted percentages, the male student population is underrepresented in the respondents by five percent, a statistically significant difference.

Minority Status

The three groups that comprise our minority category, Asian, Black, and Hispanic students, were 15 percent of the respondents and 20 percent of the fall student body. It is primarily the Black students who are underrepresented, making up eight percent of the replies and eleven percent of the fall 1983 students.

Many students, both in the sample and in the total student population, could not be categorized by race or ethnicity. The "unknown" category is 19 percent of the sample and 17 percent of the fall 1983 student body. It is possible, of course, that some of the "unknowns" are minority students and that this group, in reality, is not underrepresented.

The minority respondents, like minorities in the total student body, are unevenly distributed among the campuses. Enrollment patterns of Black, Asian and Hispanic respondents by campus parallel that of these students in the fall 1983 student body. Sixty percent of the Black respondents were enrolled at Takoma Park, 33 percent at Rockville, and four percent at Germantown. Sixty percent of the Asian respondents were enrolled at Rockville, 30 percent at Takoma Park and three percent at Germantown. The enrollment of Hispanic respondents by campus differed slightly, but not significantly, from that of the Hispanic students enrolled in fall 1983. About two thirds of the Hispanic students were enrolled at Rockville and about one third were enrolled at Takoma Park in fall 1983. A slightly larger percentage of Hispanic survey respondents were enrolled at Rockville (68%) and a slightly smaller percentage were enrolled at the Takoma Park Campus (27%).

TABLE 1
Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students

		Respondents N = 7254			Fall 1983 Students N = 20314	
		N	%	Adj. %	N	%
Campus						
	Germantown	946	13	14	2397	12
	Rockville	4222	58	60	12369	61
	Takoma Park	1434	20	20	4291	21
	Off-Campus	451	6	6	1257	6
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Credits						
	Full-time	2005	28	28	6190	30
	Part-time	5048	70	72	14124	70
	Unknown	201	2	-		
	Total	7254	100	100%	20314	100%
Time						
	Day	3710	51	53	11061	54
	Evening	2383	33	34	6414	32
	Day/Eve	960	13	14	2839	14
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Residence						
	Montgomery Co.	6487	90	92	18424	91
	Maryland	251	3	4	819	4
	Nonresidents	315	4	4	1071	5
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Sex						
	Male	2758	38	39	9035	44
	Female	4295	59	61	11279	56
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%

TABLE 1 (Continued)
Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students

	Respondents N = 7254			Fall 1983 Students N = 20314		
	N	%	Adj. %	N	%	Adj. %
Age						
15-19 years	1296	18	19	4366	22	
20-29 years	2989	41	43	9808	48	
30-39 years	1322	18	19	3270	16	
40-49 years	633	9	9	1505	7	
50 and over	666	9	10	1365	7	
Unknown	348	5	-	-	-	
Total	7254	100	100	20314	100	
Race and Ethnicity						
Asian	443	6	7	1446	7	9
Black	460	6	8	1865	9	11
Hispanic	216	3	4	787	4	5
White	4654	64	79	12153	60	72
Other	138	2	2	510	3	3
Unknown	1343	19	-	3553	17	-
	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%	100%
Transfers						
1 - 15 credits	417	6		1033	5	
16 or more credits	478	7		1036	5	
	895	13%		2069	10	

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY REPORT

PART 1: STUDENT EVALUATION OF THE COLLEGE

The data analyzed in this report include:

1. Evaluation of College activities, services and facilities.
2. The difficulty of course work and the perceived accuracy of grades.
3. Accuracy and usefulness of the College catalogue and class schedule publication.
4. Attitude toward College goals.

The data will be discussed first as it pertains to the total population of student respondents. Then variations in the responses of several subgroups of students will be pointed out. The students are grouped by: campus, full-time/part-time status, time of class attendance, sex, racial and ethnic status, residence, and credits transferred to Montgomery College.

Evaluation of College Activities, Services and Facilities

Students were asked to rate each College facility and activity as "excellent", "good", "fair" or "poor", or to check the "no knowledge/no opinion" response. For this analysis, the assumption is made that the reader's primary interest will be in discovering satisfied and unsatisfied students. Thus, differences in the percent "excellent" and percent "good" generally will not be noted, and the two ratings will be combined into the satisfied group. The analysis will focus on variations in "satisfied" "fair" and "poor" evaluations. For several items, the majority of students checked "no knowledge/no opinion". Ratings of items evaluated by less than 90 percent of those answering the question are based on the percentage of those rating the item, i.e., the "no knowledge/no opinion" respondents are eliminated. In some cases, variations among subgroups in the percentage of people rating an item may be of interest, as a rough indication of usage. Such variations will be noted.

For each item, a table is included showing total College ratings and those for each campus and off-campus students combined. Some items will have additional information presented in tabular form for subgroupings of students which deviate significantly from the total College norm, and in cases where differences between subgroups are of interest. Subgroups which have been found to parallel closely the total College in their evaluations are not presented in the tables.

Quality of Instruction

Eighty-seven percent of the respondents rated the quality of instruction as excellent or good while eleven percent rated it as fair, and one percent rated it as poor. There were no significant variations among students enrolled at the different campuses; however, off-campus students were somewhat less satisfied. Seventy-nine percent of the off-campus students rated instruction as excellent or good, 15 percent as fair, and five percent as poor. No other student group gave more than two percent poor ratings.

Asian students were significantly less satisfied than the College norm with the quality of instruction. Seventy-eight percent of the Asian respondents rated the quality of instruction as excellent or good. The ratings by Black students and by Hispanic students did not differ significantly from the College norm. Slightly lower percentages of evening and non-resident students (83% of each) gave ratings of excellent or good to the quality of instruction, a difference that does not reach statistical significance. All other subgroups did not differ significantly from the College norm (Table 2).

TABLE 2
Quality of Instruction

	Total College		Germantown N = 945	Rockville 4222	Takoma Park 1434	Off-Campus 451	Asian 443
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	1972	28	32	27	29	24	13
Good	4219	59	56	60	58	55	65
Fair	804	11	9	11	11	15	20
Poor	104	1	2	1	1	5	1
No knowledge/ No opinion	50	1	1	1	1	1	1
Total	7149	100	100	100	100	100	100

(7099 respondents, or 99 percent rated this item)

Helpfulness of Instructors in Completing a Course

The total College ratings for helpfulness of instructors were: 79 percent excellent or good, 15 percent fair, one percent poor and five percent had no knowledge or opinion.

The students at Germantown were more satisfied than this, with 85 percent rating it excellent or good. Students on the other campuses, and off-campus students did not differ from the total College ratings. The only other group of students that did differ from the norm were the minority students, who had 73 percent rating it as excellent or good, 21 percent as fair, two percent as poor, and four percent with no knowledge or opinion. Among the minorities, Asian students were the least satisfied. Only 70 percent of the Asian students rated instructor helpfulness as excellent or good (Table 3).

TABLE 3

Helpfulness of Instructors

	Total College		Germantown N = 945	Rockville 4222	Takoma Park 1434	Off-Campus 448	Asian N = 440	Black 453	Hispanic 215
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	1948	27	36	26	27	25	15	23	21
Good	3735	52	49	53	53	48	55	52	56
Fair	1048	15	9	16	15	14	22	21	19
Poor	96	1	1	1	1	2	3	2	1
No knowledge/ No opinion	326	5	5	4	4	11	5	2	3
Total	7153	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(6827 respondents, or 95% rated this item)

Courtesy of Instructors

Eighty-eight percent of all respondents rated their instructors' courtesy as excellent or good. Ten percent considered it fair, less than one percent said it was poor, and two percent had no opinion.

Germantown students were more positive than the norm. Asian and Black students were less positive in their ratings than other students, giving a lower percentage of excellent ratings and a higher percentage of fair ratings than the norm. The difference in ratings by the Asian respondents is statistically significant. No other major differences among groups in their ratings of instructor courtesy were found (Table 4).

TABLE 4

Courtesy of Instructors

	Total College		Germantown N = 946	Rockville 4222	Takoma Park 1434	Off-Campus 446	Asian N = 420	Black 446
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	2382	33	44	31	33	36	18	25
Good	3941	55	50	56	55	52	58	57
Fair	711	10	5	11	11	7	20	16
Poor	34	-	-	1	-	-	1	-
No knowledge/ No opinion	110	2	1	1	1	4	3	2
Total	7178	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(7068 respondents, or 98% rated this item)

Availability of Instructors

Seventy-one percent of the respondents felt that the availability of instructors was excellent or good, 18 percent considered it fair, and two percent thought it was poor. Nine percent checked the "no knowledge/ no opinion" response.

Since there were considerable variations among groups in percentage of "no knowledge/no opinion" answers, these were eliminated in comparing groups. When this is done, the total College norm is 78 percent excellent or good, and the ratings by campus are: Germantown (83%), Rockville (77%), Takoma Park (81%), off-campus (74%)). Thus both Germantown and Takoma Park students' ratings were more positive than the College norm, and off-campus students' ratings were somewhat less positive.

The greatest variations in ratings of instructor availability were found for minority students. Only 70 percent of the Asian students considered it excellent or good, while 84 percent of the Hispanic students rated it thus. Day/Evening students were somewhat less satisfied, with 75 percent rating it as excellent or good. No other differences from the total College norm were found (Table 5).

TABLE 5
Availability of Instructors

	Total College		German-town N = 943	Rock-ville 4222	Takoma Park 1434	Off-Campus 447	Asian 443	Hispanic 216
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	1255	18	20	16	20	14	10	17
Good	3873	53	55	55	55	43	56	64
Fair	1292	18	14	20	16	17	27	14
Poor	124	2	1	2	2	3	1	2
No knowledge/ No opinion	613	9	10	7	7	23	6	3
Total	7157	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(6544 respondents, or 91 percent rated this item)

Course Availability

Seventy-five percent of the total College respondents considered the availability of courses to be excellent or good, 21 percent considered it fair, and three percent thought it was poor. Two percent had no knowledge or opinion.

The only significant variation by campus was for Germantown students; only 70 percent of whom rated it excellent or good. Students who attend classes both in the day and evening were also less satisfied than the norm, with 68 percent rating course availability as excellent or good. Asian students were more satisfied than the norm. Eighty-four percent of the Asian students rated this as excellent or good. The other small differences among groups were not statistically significant (Table 6).

Table 6
Course Availability

	Total College		German-town N = 946	Rock-ville 4222	Takoma Park 1434	Off-Campus 451	Day/Eve N = 979	Asian 450
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	1277	18	16	18	17	19	16	21
Good	4090	57	54	57	56	59	52	63
Fair	1514	21	25	21	21	14	26	14
Poor	222	3	3	3	4	2	5	-
No knowledge/ No opinion	119	2	2	1	2	6	1	2
Total	7222	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(7103 respondents, or 98% rated this item)

Courtesy of Administrators and Staff

Seventy-four percent of all the respondents considered the courtesy of administrators and staff to be excellent or good. Fourteen percent considered it fair and two percent thought it was poor. Ten percent had no opinion on this item.

Germantown and Takoma Park students gave higher ratings than did Rockville students, and many off-campus students had no knowledge or opinion on the subject. Asian students were the least likely to rate this item as excellent or good (64%). No other significant differences were found in the ratings of this item (Table 7).

TABLE 7

Courtesy of Administrators and Staff

	Total College		German-town N = 946	Rock-ville 4222	Takoma Park 1434	Off-Campus 447	Asians 436
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	1690	24	34	20	29	18	14
Good	3639	50	50	52	49	47	50
Fair	1029	14	7	17	14	7	25
Poor	135	2	1	2	1	2	2
No knowledge/ No opinion	687	10	8	9	7	26	9
Total	7180	100	100	100	100	100	100

(6493 respondents, or 90 percent rated this item)

Admissions: Application Processing

Seventy-seven percent of the total College students rated the admissions process to be excellent or good, 16 percent considered it fair, and two percent, thought it was poor. Five percent had no opinion or knowledge about it.

Both Germantown students and Takoma Park students were more satisfied than Rockville students. Excellent and good ratings were given by 85 percent of the Germantown students, by 74 percent of the Rockville students, and by 80 percent of the Takoma Park students. No significant differences among groups were found other than the one for Germantown Campus students (Table 8).

TABLE 8

Admissions Application Processing

	Total College		German-town N = 946	Rock-ville 4222	Takoma Park 1434	Off-Campus 450
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	1640	23	32	20	27	22
Good	3873	54	53	54	53	50
Fair	1177	16	10	19	15	13
Poor	161	2	1	2	2	4
No knowledge/ No opinion	330	5	4	5	3	11
Total	7181	100	100	100	100	100

(6851 respondents, or 90 percent rated this item)

Registration: Processing Course Requests

Seventy-five percent of the total College respondents rated registration as excellent or good, 18 percent as fair, four percent as poor, and three percent had no opinion or knowledge.

A comparison of the students enrolled on different campuses reveals some differences. A larger percentage of Germantown students (86%) gave positive ratings than did Rockville students (72%) or Takoma Park students (80%). Elimination of the ten percent of the off-campus students who checked "no knowledge/no opinion" results in a satisfaction rating for this location similar to the College norm. No other variations were found in the groups (Table 9).

TABLE 9
(Processing Registration Course Requests)

	Total College		German-town N = 946	Rock-ville 4222	Takoma Park 1434	Off-Campus 448
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	1703	24	34	21	27	22
Good	3701	51	52	51	53	50
Fair	1274	18	9	21	15	15
Poor	252	4	2	4	2	3
No knowledge/ No opinion	234	3	3	3	3	10
Total	7164	100	100	100	100	100

(6930 respondents, or 97 percent rated this item)

Cashier Processing of Tuition and Fee Payments

Seventy-nine percent of the total College respondents considered the processing of tuition and fee payments to be excellent or good while 15 percent rated it as fair, and two percent thought it was poor.

The Germantown Campus had a larger percentage of satisfied students than did the Takoma Park or Rockville Campuses. Elimination of the "no knowledge/no opinion" respondents from the off-campus group results in ratings similar to the College norm for this location.

Minority students were less satisfied than non-minorities (74% versus 80% satisfied). Among minorities, Asian and Black students gave the lower ratings; Hispanic students did not. Twenty-five percent of the Asian students and 23 percent of the Black students considered cashier processing to be fair or poor while only 16 percent of the Hispanic students rated it so. Nonresident students were also less satisfied, with 25 percent rating it fair or poor.

TABLE 10

Cashier Processing of Tuition/Fee Payments

	Total College		German-town N = 946	Rock-ville 4222	Takoma Park 1434	Off-Campus 448	Asian N = 979	Black 450	Non-Residents 319
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	1838	26	35	23	28	22	17	27	21
Good	3788	53	52	55	52	49	55	48	50
Fair	1063	15	8	16	15	13	21	21	22
Poor	171	2	2	2	2	2	4	2	3
No knowledge/ No opinion	302	4	3	4	3	14	3	2	4
Total	7162	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(6860 respondents, or 96% rated this item)

Counseling and Advising

Only 74 percent of the total College respondents rated counseling and advising. Twenty-six percent checked the "no knowledge/no opinion" response. Variations in subgroups of students in the percentage of "no knowledge/no opinion" responses are as follows:

Total College	26%
Germantown	29%
Rockville	24%
Takoma Park	22%
Off-Campus	60%
Day Students	21%
Evening Students	39%
Day/Eve Students	17%
Non-Minority	29%
Minority	13%
Transfers 1-15	13%
Transfers 16+	24%
Non-Residents	17%

One interesting finding is that considerably fewer minorities stated that they had no knowledge or no opinion of the College's counseling and advising functions.

Evaluations of Counseling/Advising Eliminating the "No knowledge/No Opinion" Responses

Total College ratings were 64 percent excellent or good, 29 percent fair and seven percent poor. Germantown and Takoma Park students gave significantly higher ratings than did Rockville students. Asian and Black (but not Hispanic) students also gave somewhat higher ratings. Evening students gave somewhat lower ratings than the total College norm. However, only the differences among the campuses were statistically significant (Table 11).

TABLE 11
Counseling and Advising (No knowledge/No opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown N = 662	Rockville 3201	Takoma Park 1097	Off-Campus 178	Evening 1447	Asian 387	Black 386	Hispanic 188
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	919	18	22	16	22	11	13	16	23	25
Good	2382	46	49	44	48	52	47	52	47	38
Fair	1519	29	24	31	24	33	32	28	25	29
Poor	389	7	5	9	6	4	8	4	5	8
Total	5209	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(5209 respondents, or 74% rated this item)

Assessment Testing

Only 65 percent of the total College respondents rated assessment testing. Thirty-five percent checked the "no knowledge/no opinion" response. There were also wide variations among subgroups of students in the percentage of students checking this response. These variations may be of interest.

Percent "No Knowledge/No Opinion"

Total College	35
Germantown	39
Rockville	34
Takoma Park	30
Off-Campus	55
Full-Time Students	19
Part-Time Students	42
Day	29
Evening	48
Day/Eve	30
Non-Minority	40
Minority	19
Transfers	41
Residents of Montgomery County	36
Non-Residents	24
Residents of Maryland	29
Males	31
Females	38

Evaluations of Assessment Testing Eliminating the No Knowledge/No Opinion Responses

Seventy-one percent of the total College respondents rated the assessment testing programs as excellent or good, 26 percent rated them as fair, and three percent thought they were poor. Takoma Park and Germantown students were more satisfied than Rockville students.

Evening students were more satisfied than day or day/evening students. Part-time students were more satisfied than full-time students. No differences were found for minorities and nonminorities, males or females, or transfer students (Table 12).

TABLE 12
Assessment Testing
(No Knowledge/No Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown N = 569	Rockville 2712	Takoma Park 984	Day N =2566	Eve 1223	Day/ Eve 672	Full-time 1623	Part-time 2838
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	507	11	13	10	14	11	12	11	7	13
Good	2706	60	62	59	62	59	63	59	57	63
Fair	1171	26	22	28	22	27	23	26	32	22
Poor	136	3	3	3	2	3	2	4	4	2
Total	4520	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(4520 respondents, or 65% rated this item)

Reading, Writing, and Language Skills Programs

Only 30 percent of the total College respondents evaluated the reading, writing & language skills programs. Full-time students, minorities (especially Asian and Hispanic students), and nonresidents had larger percentages of students evaluating the language skills programs. Only 42 off-campus students, or nine percent, rated this item.

Evaluations Eliminating the "No Knowledge/No Opinion" responses.

Eighty percent of the students rating these programs felt they were excellent or good. The only variation from this total College norm was a more positive rating by the Germantown students: 87 percent felt the program on that campus was excellent or good (Table 13).

TABLE 13
Reading, Writing, Language Skills Program
(No Knowledge/No Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown N = 172	Rockville 1328	Takoma Park 485
	N	%	%	%	%
Excellent	525	26	26	25	27
Good	1116	54	61	54	54
Fair	370	18	11	19	17
Poor	46	2	2	2	2
Total	2057	100	100	100	100

(2057 respondents, or 30 percent rated this item)

Reading and Writing Centers

Twenty-eight percent of the respondents evaluated the condition of the Reading and Writing Centers. Seventy-two percent indicated that they had no knowledge/no opinion.

Evaluations Eliminating the "No Knowledge/No Opinion" Responses

Eighty-three percent of the total College respondents rated the Centers as excellent or good, 15 percent rated them as fair and two percent as poor. Germantown students* were the most positive in their ratings. No other differences were found (Table 4).

TABLE 14
The Reading and Writing Center - Physical Condition**
(No Knowledge or Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown* N = 139	Rockville 1304	Takoma Park 439
	N	%	%	%	%
Excellent	493	25	29	24	27
Good	1113	57	62	56	59
Fair	296	15	9	17	13
Poor	38	2	0	3	1
Total	1940	100	100	100	100

(1940 respondents, or 28 percent rated this item)

---

*The Germantown Campus does not have a specific facility called a Reading & Writing Center. Presumably students rated the condition of the area where the reading and writing skills are taught.

**Only six percent of the Off-Campus students rated this item. They are not included in the table.

Math Skills Improvement Program

The math skills improvement program was evaluated by 26 percent of the total College respondents. Larger percentages of students evaluating the math skills program were found in the following groups: seventy-nine percent of the transfers with 16 or more credits, 54 percent of the Asian students, 53 percent of the Hispanic students, 43 percent of the Black students, 42 percent of the full-time students, 41 percent of the nonresidents, and 36 percent of the day/evening students. Only 32 off-campus students, or seven percent of them rated this item.

Evaluations Eliminating the "No Knowledge/No Opinion" Respondents

Eighty-one percent of the total College respondents rated the math skills program as excellent or good, 17 percent rated it as fair, and two percent rated it as poor. There were no significant differences by campus or by any student sub-group from the total College norm (Table 15).

TABLE 15
Math Skills Improvement Program*
(No Knowledge/No Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown N = 162	Rockville 1139	Takoma Park 476
	N	%	%	%	%
Excellent	447	24	22	24	27
Good	1042	57	58	57	55
Fair	311	17	17	17	17
Poor	38	2	3	2	1
Total	1838	100	100	100	100

(1838 respondents, or 26 percent rated this item)

*Off-Campus excluded because of small N

Math Skills Centers

Twenty-eight percent of the total College respondents evaluated the physical condition of the Math Skills Centers. Seventy-two percent of the respondents did not rate these facilities.

Evaluation Eliminating the "No Knowledge/No Opinion" Responses

Eighty-one percent of the total College respondents rated the Math Skills Centers as excellent or good, 17 percent rated them as fair, and two percent rated them as poor. There were no significant differences in these ratings by campus or other sub-groups (Table 16).

TABLE 16
Math Skills Center*
(No Knowledge/No Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown N = 124	Rockville 1167	Takoma Park 509
	N	%	%	%	%
Excellent	420	23	21	23	23
Good	1074	58	59	59	54
Fair	323	17	17	16	20
Poor	43	2	3	2	3
Total	1860	100	100	100	100

(1860 respondents, or 26 percent rated this item)

*Only six percent of the Off-Campus students rated this item.

Library Services

Seventy-four percent of the total College respondents evaluated the library services. Twenty-three percent of all respondents rated them as excellent, 42 percent as good, eight percent as fair, one percent as poor, and 26 percent indicated no knowledge or opinion.

Student groups with greater percentages of evaluators of library services were: full-time students (94%), day students and day/evening students (84%), minorities (84%), Hispanic students (90%), and transfer students with 1-15 credits (88%). Only 27 percent of the off-campus students, and only 55 percent of the evening students evaluated library services.

Evaluations Eliminating "No Knowledge/No Opinion" Responses

Eighty-eight percent considered library services to be excellent or good, eleven percent as fair, and one percent as poor. Germantown students were somewhat more satisfied than this, and Takoma Park students were slightly less satisfied. No other significant differences were found in the ratings by sub-groups (Table 17).

TABLE 17
Library Services
(No Knowledge or Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		German-town N = 685	Rock-ville 3282	Takoma Park 1106	Off-Campus 122
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	1634	31	39	30	28	26
Good	2982	57	53	58	55	62
Fair	588	11	7	11	15	10
Poor	61	1	1	1	2	2
Total	5265	100	100	100	100	100

(5265 respondents, or 74 percent rated this item)

Condition of the Library Facilities

Eighty-one percent of the total College respondents evaluated the condition of the libraries. Twenty-eight percent of all respondents rated them as excellent, 46 percent as good, six percent as fair, less than one percent as poor, and 19 percent indicated no knowledge or opinion.

Evaluations Eliminating the "No Knowledge/No Opinion" Responses

The condition of the libraries were considered to be excellent or good by 92 percent of the total College respondents. Germantown students were the most positive; 45 percent rated the library as excellent. Full-time students were less positive than part-time students (Table 18).

TABLE 18

The Library (No Knowledge or Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown N = 755	Rockville 3494	Takoma Park 1150	Full-Time N = 1972	Part-Time 3581
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	1963	35	45	34	31	16	34
Good	3172	57	51	57	57	59	58
Fair	422	8	4	8	10	21	7
Poor	50	-	0	1	2	4	1
Total	5607	100	100	100	100	100	100

(5607 respondents, or 81% rated this item)

Financial Aid

Only 27 percent of the total College respondents evaluated financial aid. Seventy-three percent checked the "no knowledge/no opinion" response.

Those student categories with a considerably larger percentage of people rating this item than the 27 percent College norm were: full-time (45%), evening (41%), minority (53%), Asian (60%), Black (49%), Hispanic (49%), and Takoma Park (38%).

Evaluations Eliminating the No Knowledge/No Opinion Responses

Of those that rated financial aid services, 70 percent overall said they were excellent or good. Those groups of students who were more satisfied than the norm were minorities (76%), especially Hispanic students (82%), and Takoma Park students (74%). No other major differences were found, excepting that nonminorities were less positive (65% excellent or good) than the norm (Table 19).

TABLE 19
Financial Aid
(No Knowledge/No Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		German-town N = 175	Rock-ville 1137	Takoma Park 523	Minorities 578
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	467	24	25	23	29	25
Good	868	46	46	45	45	51
Fair	444	23	24	25	20	21
Poor	128	7	5	7	6	3
Total	1907	100	100	100	100	100

(1907 respondents, or 27% rated this item)

Job Placement Assistance

Only 16 percent of the total College respondents evaluated job placement assistance. Although some job placement services exist on all campuses, the extent of the services varies.

Subgroups of students with larger percentages evaluating the job placement services were: Takoma Park students (20%), full-time students (26%), day students (20%), day and evening students (23%), minority students (36%), and nonresidents (22%). Among minorities, 46 percent of the Asian students evaluated this item, compared to 29 percent of the Black students and 30 percent of the Hispanic students. Off-campus, Germantown, part-time, evening, and nonminority students had fewer evaluators of the job placement program than the College norm.

Evaluations Eliminating the "No Knowledge/No Opinion" Responses

Sixty-two percent of those who evaluated job placement assistance indicated that it was excellent or good, 29 percent rated it as fair, and nine percent as poor. Germantown students were the most satisfied, and transfer students were the least satisfied. Asian, Black and transfer students all had over 40 percent that considered it fair or poor (Table 20).

TABLE 20
Job Placement Assistance
(No Knowledge/No Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown N = 100	Rockville 678	Takoma Park 286	Total Transfers 142	Asian 195	Black 127	Nonres 59
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	180	16	22	16	16	15	10	17	20
Good	509	46	51	46	45	38	45	41	48
Fair	313	29	21	28	31	32	39	32	27
Poor	100	9	6	10	8	14	6	10	5
Total	1102	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(1102 respondents, or 16% rated this item)

Physical Condition of Classrooms

Ninety-six percent of our respondents evaluated the physical condition of the classrooms. Seventy-one percent considered them to be excellent or good, 23 percent as fair, two percent as poor, and four percent indicated no knowledge or opinion.

There were significant differences in the ratings by students enrolled on the three campuses. A much larger percentage of Germantown students were satisfied than those at the Takoma Park or Rockville Campuses. Thirty-seven percent of the Germantown students rated them excellent. Evening students were less positive than day students. The evaluations by off-campus students were computed eliminating the 35 percent that had no opinion on this item. Their ratings are less positive than the total College norm: 63 percent considered them excellent or good (Table 21).

TABLE 21
Physical Condition of Classrooms

	Total College		Germantown N = 923	Rockville 4149	Takoma Park 1401	Off-Campus 433	Day 3622	Eve 2334
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	918	13	37	7	17	6	14	12
Good	3973	58	54	58	61	35	59	52
Fair	1635	23	6	30	17	21	22	25
Poor	162	2	1	3	2	3	2	3
No Knowledge/ No Opinion	305	4	2	2	3	35	3	8
Total	6993	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(6688 respondents, or 96% rated this item)

Parking Lot (Space Availability)

The space availability of the parking lot was evaluated by 92 percent of the total College respondents. Forty-four percent rated it as excellent or good, 30 percent as fair, and 18 percent as poor.

There were wide variations in ratings by campus. The Germantown parking lot was rated the highest. Elimination of the "no opinion" respondents at Takoma Park and off-Campus results in satisfied ratings of 62 percent excellent or good at Takoma Park and 53 percent excellent or good Off-Campus, both above the College norm of 44 percent. Day students were less satisfied than the College norm, and evening students were more satisfied (Table 22).

TABLE 22
Parking Lot (Space Availability)

	Total College		German-town N = 931	Rock-ville 4125	Takoma Park 1395	Off-Campus 428	Day 3615	Eve 2325
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	731	10	25	6	15	6	9	13
Good	2329	34	49	29	39	28	29	43
Fair	2054	30	19	35	23	22	31	26
Poor	1279	18	5	25	10	10	23	9
No Knowledge/ No Opinion	573	8	2	5	13	34	8	9
Total	6966	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(6393 respondents, or 92% rated this item)

Security

Security was evaluated by 59 percent of the respondents. The ratings of security, eliminating the 41 percent who checked no knowledge or opinion, were: 77 percent excellent or good, 19 percent fair, and four percent poor. Germantown students were the most satisfied, and Rockville students the least satisfied with security when campuses are compared. Minority students were somewhat less satisfied than nonminorities (Table 23).

TABLE 23
Security
(No Knowledge/No Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown N = 646	Rockville 2339	Takoma Park 950	Nonminority 2613	Minority 749
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	671	17	29	13	16	16	15
Good	2471	60	61	61	61	62	58
Fair	770	19	9	22	19	18	23
Poor	152	4	1	4	4	4	3
Total	4060	100	100	100	100	100	100

(4060 respondents, or 59% rated this item)

Child Care Center

The child care centers were evaluated by seven percent of the respondents. Eighty-three percent of those responding gave it an excellent or good rating, 13 percent fair, and four percent poor. Germantown students gave the highest ratings. This campus' 59 percent "excellent" rating made the Germantown child care center the most highly rated facility of all. Minority students and evening students were somewhat less satisfied than the total College norm (Table 24).

TABLE 24
Child Care Center
(No Knowledge/No Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown	Rockville	Takoma Park	Non-minority	Minority	Eve
			N = 78	304	162	300	159	96
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	160	29	59	24	26	36	15	26
Good	303	54	30	59	54	52	60	49
Fair	71	13	8	13	15	9	19	17
Poor	22	4	3	4	5	3	6	8
Total	556	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(556 respondents, or 7% rated this item)

Condition of the Bookstores

The condition of the bookstore was evaluated by 94 percent of the total College respondents. Sixty-nine percent rated them as excellent or good, 21 percent as fair and four percent as poor.

Takoma Park students were more satisfied with their bookstore than were students on the other campuses. Seventy-seven percent of the Takoma Park students rated it as excellent or good. Elimination of the no opinion respondents in the off-campus groups results in ratings similar to the total College norm. No other differences in ratings were found (Table 25).

TABLE 25
Condition of the Bookstore

	Total College		Germantown N = 923	Rockville 4222	Takoma Park 1400	Off-Campus 430
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	990	14	16	13	19	8
Good	3854	55	53	55	58	46
Fair	1457	21	22	23	16	16
Poor	259	4	5	4	2	3
No Knowledge/ No Opinion	415	6	4	5	5	27
Total	6975	100	100	100	100	100

(6560 respondents, or 94% rated this item)

Laboratories

The laboratories were evaluated by 47 percent of the respondents. When the "no knowledge/no opinion" responses are eliminated, 79 percent of those rating the laboratories stated that they were excellent or good, 17 percent fair, and four percent said they were poor. Germantown students gave the highest ratings and Rockville students the lowest. Evening students were less satisfied than day students. More transfer students gave satisfied ratings than the College norm (Table 26).

TABLE 26
Laboratories
(No Knowledge/No Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown N = 381	Rockville 1956	Takoma Park 816	Day 1877	Eve 747	Transfer 459
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	693	21	38	17	24	23	16	25
Good	1888	58	49	58	62	59	57	57
Fair	540	17	8	20	12	16	18	13
Poor	138	4	5	5	2	3	9	5
Total	3259	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(3259 respondents, or 47% rated this item)

Cafeterias

The cafeterias were evaluated by 67 percent of the respondents. Of those evaluating them, fifty-two percent considered them excellent or good, 36 percent fair and twelve percent poor. Germantown Campus students were much more satisfied with the cafeteria than students on the other campuses. Minorities gave lower ratings than nonminorities, and day/evening students were also less satisfied than the total College norm (Table 27).

TABLE 27
Cafeteria
(No Knowledge/No Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown N = 689	Rockville 2877	Takoma Park 977	Non-min 3023	Min 830	Day/Eve 745
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	370	8	25	5	6	8	6	7
Good	2073	44	58	42	42	45	40	41
Fair	1677	36	16	40	38	36	39	38
Poor	549	12	1	13	14	11	15	15
Total	4669	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(4669 respondents, or 67% rated this item)

Social/Recreational Facilities

The social and recreational facilities, such as game rooms and lounges, were evaluated by 45 percent of the respondents. Sixty-three percent of those evaluating these facilities rated them as excellent or good, 30 percent as fair, and seven percent as poor. The students at Germantown gave the highest ratings and those at Takoma Park gave the lowest. Minority students and transfer students gave somewhat lower ratings than the College norm (Table 28).

TABLE 28
Social/Recreation
(No Knowledge/No Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown N = 462	Rockville 1973	Takoma Park 649	Non Min 1955	Min 616	Total Transfer 394
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	367	12	21	11	8	12	8	8
Good	1610	51	58	49	47	50	50	48
Fair	964	30	19	33	33	31	33	35
Poor	229	7	2	7	12	7	9	9
Total	3170	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

(3170 respondents, or 45% rated this item)

Athletic Facilities

The athletic facilities were evaluated by 39 percent of the respondents. Eighty-three percent of those responding considered them to be excellent or good, 15 percent as fair, and two percent as poor. Germantown students gave the highest ratings. Rockville and Takoma Park students ratings were similar to the total College norm. Minority students were somewhat less satisfied than nonminorities (Table 29).

TABLE 29
Athletic Facilities
(No Knowledge/No Opinion Eliminated)

	Total College		Germantown N = 365	Rockville 1572	Takoma Park 631	Non-min 1662	Min 528
	N	%	%	%	%	%	%
Excellent	552	21	39	17	22	23	14
Good	1645	62	53	65	60	63	61
Fair	406	15	8	16	17	13	23
Poor	47	2	0	2	1	1	2
Total	2650	100	100	100	100	100	100

(2650 respondents, or 39 percent rated this item)

Difficulty of Course Work

Respondents were asked to assess the difficulty of their course work by indicating whether work was harder, easier, or similar to that expected.

Most of the respondents considered the course work to be about as difficult as they had expected. Seventy-two percent of our respondents gave this answer. Nineteen percent found it harder, and nine percent found it easier than expected (Table 30).

TABLE 30

How Would you, In General, Assess the Difficulty of your Course Work?

	Total College		Germantown	Rockville	Takoma Park	Off-Campus
	No. of Respondents	Percent of Respondents	926	4165	1403	446
Harder than I expected	1366	19%	17	20	20	19
About what I expected	5017	72%	73	71	70	71
Easier than I expected	643	9%	10	9	10	10
Total	7026	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Accuracy of Final Grades

Accuracy of grades was assessed by 66 percent (4573) of the respondents. Thirty-four percent indicated "no final grades received".

Eighty-four percent of the respondents felt their grades were accurate and 16 percent felt they were not an accurate reflection of the knowledge and performance of their course work.

There were a number of differences between subgroups of students in their assessment of the accuracy of grades. The comparisons that follow give the percent responding that their final grades were accurate (Table 31).

TABLE 31

Percentage Responding that their Final Grades were Accurate

Total College	84%	Day	82%
		Evening	89%
Germantown	91%	Day/Eve	81%
Rockville	82%		
Takoma Park	85%	Asian	83%
Off-Campus	91%	Black	69%
		Hispanic	82%
Full-time	77%	Nonminority	86%
Part-time	87%		
		Total Transfers	88%
Males	81%	Montgomery County	84%
Females	87%	Maryland	84%
		Nonresidents	84%

Accuracy of College Catalog

Ninety-three percent (93%) of the total College respondents answered "yes" to the question "Do the College Catalog Descriptions Accurately Reflect the Subjects Taught in The Courses You Have Taken?" Seven percent (7%) answered "No." No variations among subgroups were found (Table 32).

TABLE 32
Do The College Catalog Descriptions Accurately Reflect
The Subjects Taught in Courses You Have Taken?

	No. of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Yes	6125	93%
No	440	7%
Total	6565	100%

Usefulness of The Class Schedule Publication

All but four percent of the total College respondents found the Class Schedule for the current semester (fall 1983) to be a highly usable publication. No variations among subgroups were found (Table 33).

TABLE 33
TOTAL COLLEGE
Did You Find the Class Schedule for the Current Semester
to be a Highly Usable Publication?

	No. of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Yes	6318	96%
No	258	4%
Total	6576	100%

Rating of College Goals

Respondents were given a list of twelve College goals and asked to rate them as "Very Important", "Important", "Not Important" or "Undecided". All the goals listed received widespread support by all subgroups of students. Nine of the 12 goals were considered very important or important by over 90 percent. All the goals are listed in order of the percent of "very important" or "important" responses (Table 34).

TABLE 34
Rating of College Goals

1.	Provide students with appropriate education and training beyond high school	98%
2.	Provide students with specific skills in career and transfer programs	97%
3.	Maintain low tuition and fees	97%
4.	Provide courses and programs for updating job skills	96%
5.	Provide quality programs and services	96%
6.	Provide an environment to encourage life-long learning	95%
7.	Provide courses and programs for retraining or new careers	95%
8.	Provide academic and career counseling	95%
9.	Provide handicapped student services	93%
10.	Provide review courses	85%
11.	Maintain an open-door admissions policy	85%
12.	Provide assessment testing	82%

There were very few "undecided" responses, the largest, (10%), was for assessment testing. The first three goals listed may be considered top scorers in that a large majority of all students rated them as "Very Important".

The only group of students that differed appreciably from the total College were the Asian students. They had more "Undecided" responses and were more likely to rate goals as "Important" rather than "Very Important". Their highest ranked goal was "Maintain low tuition and fees", with 67 percent rating it "Very Important".

SUMMARY

Overall, the student evaluations for the College are very favorable. A large majority of respondents gave excellent or good ratings to every item evaluated, except parking space availability and the cafeterias. The percentage of excellent plus good ratings on all items range from a high of 92 percent for the physical facility of the library to a low of only 44 percent for parking space availability.

The items which received the highest ratings overall, with 80 percent or more of the student evaluators considering them excellent or good are: quality of instruction, courtesy of instructors, helpfulness of instructors, library services and facilities, athletic facilities, child care centers, language skills programs and facilities, and math skills program and facilities.

Items which were rated excellent or good by 70-79 percent of the respondents are: availability of instructors, course availablity, courtesy of administrators and staff, laboratory facilities, security, admissions, registration and cashier processing, assessment testing, financial aid, and the physical condition of the classrooms.

Those which were rated excellent or good by 60-69 percent of the students are: the bookstore, social and recreational facilities, counseling/advising, and job placement. Only 52 percent considered the cafeterias to be excellent or good.

Variations in Ratings by Campus

Overall, Germantown students were more satisfied than were students on the other campuses or off-campus students. In many cases the differences are small, but the pattern of greater satisfaction is quite consistent. Items which are rated more highly by a significantly larger percentage of Germantown students include: helpfulness of instructors, courtesy of instructors, courtesy of administrators and staff, admission, registration, cashier processing of tuition and fee payments, counseling and advising, job placement, the physical condition of the library, the physical condition of the classrooms, parking lot space availability, the laboratories, the cafeteria, the social and recreational facilities, the athletic facilties, security, and the child care center. Also, a greater percentage of Germantown students considered their final grades to be an accurate reflection of their knowledge and performance of course work. Germantown students were, however, less pleased with course availability than the College norm.

Students enrolled at Rockville were less satisfied than those at Germantown and Takoma Park with assessment testing, counseling/advising, the courtesy of administrators and staff, and the physical condition of the labs. The physical condition of the classrooms and the parking space availability were rated considerably lower by Rockville students. A majority rated the cafeteria as fair or poor.

Takoma Park students rated the financial aid program and the bookstore more highly than students on the other campuses. However, they rated the library services and facility and the social and recreational facilities less positively. A majority rated the cafeteria as fair or poor.

Off-campus students were somewhat less satisfied with the quality of instruction, the availablity of instructors, and the condition of the classrooms than the on-campus students.

Minorities

Minority students as a whole differed from nonminority students in their evaluations of some items. Generally the differences were in the direction of lesser satisfaction, but the Asian, Black, and Hispanic students that comprised the minority group were not always similar in their evaluations.

Minority students as a whole were less satisfied than nonminority students on the following items: the cafeteria, athletic facilities, social and recreational facilities, child care facilities, and security. They were more satisfied with the financial aid program than nonminority students.

There were significantly larger percentages of minority students (fewer "No Knowledge/No Opinion" responses) who evaluated counseling/advising, library services, financial aid, job placement, assessment testing, and the language skills and math skills improvement programs.

Asian students tended to be less satisfied than Black or Hispanic students. The most striking differences are in their ratings of helpfulness and availability of instructors and of the quality of instruction. Seventy percent or more of the Asians rated these items as excellent or good, but this is significantly below the College norm for these items. Asian students also were less likely to rate the courtesy of instructors and of administrators and staff as excellent or good. Both Black and Asian students were less satisfied with the job placement program than were the Hispanic students. Asian students were, however, more satisfied than the College norm with course availability and with counseling/advising.

Black students, like the Asians, were less satisfied with the helpfulness, availability, and courtesy of instructors, but their ratings on these items were not as low as those of the Asian students. Black students were the least likely to feel that their grades were accurate. They were more satisfied than the College norm with counseling/advising.

Hispanics tended to be the most satisfied of the minority students. Their evaluations of helpfulness, availability and courtesy of instructors, and of quality of instruction were as positive or more positive than the College norm. They were more pleased with the job placement program than were Asian and Black students, and their greater satisfaction with the financial aid program is statistically significant.

Other Differences

Most of the variations in evaluations were found in comparisons of students grouped by campus or by minority status. However, some other differences were found.

Males and Females

The only major difference between the evaluations given by males and by females was on the question of the accuracy of grades. Eighty-seven percent of the females considered their grades to be accurate, while 81 percent of the males considered them to be accurate.

Full-time and Part-time Students

A comparison of the evaluations of full-time and part-time students revealed three statistically significant differences. Full-time students were less satisfied with assessment testing, the physical condition of the library, and the accuracy of grades.

Residence: Montgomery County, Maryland and Nonresident

A comparison of students by residence revealed only one significant difference. The 315 nonresident students were less satisfied with cashier processing of tuition and fees. Seventy-one percent rated it excellent or good, compared to the 79 percent College norm.

Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students

There were several differences in the evaluations by students grouped according to when they attend classes.

Day students were less satisfied with assessment testing and parking and more satisfied with the physical condition of the labs. A slightly larger percentage (3% greater than the College norm) felt the course work was more difficult than expected.

As compared to the College norms, evening students were less satisfied with the quality of instruction, counseling/advising, physical condition of the classrooms and labs, and child care facilities. They were more satisfied with parking and the accuracy of grades.

Day/Evening students were less satisfied with course availability, instructor availability, assessment testing, and the cafeteria.

Students Transferring Credits to MC

As compared to College norms, transfer students were more satisfied with the accuracy of grades and the condition of the labs. They were less satisfied with social and recreational facilities and with the job placement program.

Variations in the Percentage of Evaluators Responding to Specific Questions

Those items on the list that were evaluated by fewer students, such as job placement, language and math skills improvement programs, financial aid, etc., were more likely to be evaluated by certain subgroups of students. These subgroups are: minorities, full-time students, day and day/evening students, nonresidents and Takoma Park students. Thus the total College ratings of items rated by fewer students reflect the opinions of these groups somewhat more than would be expected based on their numbers in the total College population.

Recommendations

Overall, the evaluations of the College done by these students enrolled in fall 1983 are quite reassuring. It appears that for the most part, the experience of these students at Montgomery College has been positive. However, the findings reported here rather clearly suggest some possible areas for improvement. Some general recommendations could be made now, but we prefer to postpone the recommendations for a future report. The reason for this is that a great many respondents wrote quite specific and detailed reasons for their dissatisfaction. This voluminous information is still being recorded and will be the subject of a future report. We feel that making recommendations at this point is premature. However, the findings in this report provide some insight as to which College activities and facilities were considered to be less satisfactory by the respondents.

Current Student Survey Report: Part 2 Educational Goals and Reasons for Attending Montgomery College

Montgomery College
Office of Institutional Research
Montgomery County, Maryland
January 1985

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY REPORT: PART 2

EDUCATIONAL GOALS AND REASONS FOR ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

January 1985

Office of Institutional Research
William E. Campbell, Director
Kathy Rose, Research Analyst II
Marcia Scott, Research Analyst I
Marilynn P. Smith, Administrative Associate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Executive Summary iii

List of Tables. viii

Introduction: Current Student Survey. 1

Summary: Why Students Attend Montgomery College

Total College Respondents. 7

Rockville Students. 8

Germantown Students 8

Takoma Park Students. 9

Off-Campus Students 9

Minority Students: Asian, Black, and Hispanic Students 10

Male and Female Students. 10

Day, Evening, and Day/Evening Students. 11

Full-Time and Part-Time Students. 11

Transfer Students. 12

Montgomery County, Maryland, and Nonresident Students 13

Group Comparisons on Each Question

Primary Reason for Attending Montgomery College. . . . 13

(1) Preparation for Transfer 14

(2) Preparation for Immediate Career Entry 14

(3) Interest and Self-Enrichment 14

(4) Update Skills for Career Advancement 14

(5) Explore New Academic or Career Areas 15

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Educational Goal While Attending Montgomery College

(1) Earn an Associate Degree. 15

(2) Complete Desired Courses, Not Earn a Degree or Certificate. 16

(3) Earn a Certificate. 16

Reasons for Choosing Montgomery College

(1) Convenient Location 16

(2) Low Tuition 17

(3) Offers Desired Programs 17

(4) Reputation of College 17

(5) Recommended by a Friend 17

(6) Reputation of Faculty 17

(7) Recommended by Family Members 18

(8) Recommended by High School Teacher or Counselor. 18

Length of Time for Achievement of Goals at Montgomery College. 18

Conclusion. 20

Appendix: Tables. 23

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Title: Current Student Survey Report: Part 2
Educational Goals and Reasons for Attending Montgomery College

Purpose: This report focuses on the topic of student's educational needs and goals. The findings can be useful in evaluating the College's success in helping students achieve their goals. The information includes the reasons why the students were attending Montgomery College and their estimates of the length of time it would take to achieve their goals at the College.

Methodology: A questionnaire was sent during the month of November, 1983 to all students enrolled in credit courses. Those students not responding were sent a follow-up questionnaire. The response rate was 35.7 percent of the student body (7,254/20,314). The respondents are proportionally representative of the fall student body on campus of enrollment, full-time/part-time status, time of class attendance, residence and credits transferred to Montgomery College. Somewhat underrepresented in the respondents are students under 30 years of age, males and minorities.

The four questions on the topic of educational goals have been analyzed so as to reveal similarities and differences among several student groups. Responses were analyzed by campus, by sex, by full-time/part-time status, by time of class attendance, by racial/ethnic status, by residence and by credits transferred to Montgomery College. Statistically significant differences are reported; i.e., those that reach the .01 or .05 level of confidence.

Limitations: The underrepresentation of younger students, males and minorities will affect the total College summary statistics somewhat. Smaller samples have a greater chance of being non-representative of the larger population, and so more caution should be exercized in generalizing from the data obtained from males, minorities and younger students.

The lack of anonymity of respondents is probably not a problem for the data in this report. There appear to be few reasons to fear disclosing this information.

Findings: In order to summarize the findings, an imaginary "typical Montgomery College student" will be described. This typical student is based on the total College responses to the four questions on educational goals, and the characteristics cited are the ones stated most frequently. Then a typical student from each campus will be compared to the total College typical student. Finally, a brief summary of the educational goals of the other subgroups of students will be presented. The pronoun "she" will be used to refer to our typical student, since over half of our respondents on each campus were females. However, the descriptions refer to the majority of students, regardless of sex.

The typical Montgomery College student is probably attending the College to prepare to transfer to a four-year institution. She is about half as likely to be preparing for immediate career entry, updating skills for career advancement, or attending because of interest or self-enrichment. There is a one in ten chance that she is exploring new academic or career areas. She probably wants to earn an A.A. degree at Montgomery College, but she is almost equally likely to be taking courses without regard to earning a degree or certificate. She has chosen to attend Montgomery College because of its convenient location, low tuition, desirable programs and the reputation of the College. She may be uncertain about how long it will take to achieve her goal at Montgomery College, but she probably will expect to finish within four semesters.

If she is enrolled on the Rockville Campus, she is even more likely to be preparing to transfer. Otherwise she is like our typical student.

If she is enrolled on the Takoma Park Campus, she probably is preparing for transfer but she is more likely to be preparing for immediate career entry than is our typical Montgomery College student. She is more likely to want an A.A. degree, and less likely to express disinterest in either a degree or certificate. Her time estimate is similar to that of the typical student, as are her reasons for choosing Montgomery College. However, she is more likely than the typical Montgomery College student to say the recommendation of a friend influenced her choice of Montgomery College.

If she is enrolled at the Germantown Campus, she is still probably preparing for tranfer, but she is almost as likely to be updating skills for career advancement or attending because of interest or self-enrichment. She is about as likely to say her goal is an A.A. degree as to express disinterest in earning a degree or certificate. She, like the typical Montgomery College student, expects to finish within four semesters. She chose Montgomery College for the same reasons as the typical Montgomery College student, but she is even more likely to say the convenient location of the campus influenced her choice.

If she is enrolled off-campus, she is least like our typical student. She is most probably updating skills for career advancement. However, she may be attending because of interest, or perhaps exploring new academic or career areas. She is not as likely to be preparing to transfer or for immediate career entry as the on-campus students. She probably is not interested in a degree or a certificate and she probably declined to estimate the time it would take to achieve her goal at Montgomery College. If she did give a time estimate, it was most likely six or more semesters.

Preparation for transfer was the most frequently given reason for attending Montgomery College by all groups of students except evening and off-campus students. This reason for attendance was given by over half of the full-time students, day/evening students, and non-residents.

Preparation for immediate career entry was the reason for attending Montgomery College given by almost one quarter of the respondents from Takoma Park, by transfer students, and by day/evening students.

Interest and self-enrichment was the reason given by 20-27 percent of the off-campus students, part-time students, Germantown students, and evening students.

Updating skills for career advancement was the reason given by about one third of the off-campus students and evening students. One quarter of the Maryland residents also gave this reason for attending Montgomery College.

Exploration of new academic and career areas was the reason given by 15-16 percent of the off-campus, evening, and students who had transferred 16 or more credits to Montgomery College.

Almost half the respondents said their goal at Montgomery College was an A.A. degree. This was true of more than half of the transfer students, Black and Hispanic students, day/evening students, full-time students, and Takoma Park students. Asian, Hispanic and nonresident students had the largest percentages desiring a certificate (12-19%).

About two-thirds of the respondents estimated the length of time it would take to achieve their goal at Montgomery College. The majority expected to finish within four semesters. However, between 34 percent and 47 percent of all student groups expected it to take five or more semesters.

All student groups were in agreement on the four main reasons for choosing to attend Montgomery College: convenient location, low tuition, desired programs, and reputation of the College. The differences among groups were found primarily in the additional reasons given for their choice. The recommendation of a friend was more frequently checked by minority students, day students, nonresidents, and Takoma Park students. The reputation of the College and of the faculty was more often checked by Hispanic students. The recommendation of family members was mentioned more often by full-time students. The recommendation of a high school teacher or counselor was cited more often by Asian and Hispanic students (9% and 10%).

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE

Table 1 Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students 5

Appendix

Tables on: Primary Reason for Attending Montgomery College
Goal While Attending Montgomery College
Length of Time to Achieve Goal at MC
Reasons for Choosing Montgomery College

Tables with above titles are presented for each of the groups presented below.

1-4 Total College and Students by Campus 24

5-8 Asian, Black and Hispanic Students 26

9-12 Male and Female Students 27

13-16 Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students. 28

17-20 Full-Time and Part-Time Students 29

21-24 Students Transferring Credits to MC. 30

25-28 Montgomery County, Maryland and Nonresident Students 31

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The Current Student Survey is one of five components of a Community Assessment Program study being conducted by the College's Office of Institutional Research. The purpose of the Current Student Survey is to find out from currently enrolled students their opinions on the quality of College programs, services and facilities; their perception and knowledge of the College; their educational goals and expectations; their preferences on class scheduling; their use of the media; and a number of demographic factors. The data will be used to determine how well the College is meeting the educational needs of its students and how to better communicate with them.

The reports on the Current Student Survey will be issued in several parts based on the following topics:

1. Student Evaluation of Montgomery College
2. Educational Goals and Reasons for Attending MC
3. Knowledge about Montgomery College
4. Media Use
5. Preferences on Class Scheduling
6. Demographics
7. Open-ended responses

It was thought important to find out if there are differences in the opinions and needs of several subgroups in the student population. Therefore, the data obtained will be analyzed so as to compare the responses of the following student groups: students enrolled at the different campuses and at off-campus locations; students attending in the day, evening and day/evening; students enrolled full-time and part-time; males and females; Asian, Black, and Hispanic students; students who have transferred to Montgomery College; and Montgomery County residents, Maryland residents, and nonresidents.

Methodology

In the fall semester of 1983, 20,314 students were enrolled in credit courses on all three campuses and at off-campus locations. All students were sent a questionnaire during the month of November, 1983, and those not responding were sent a follow-up questionnaire. Seven thousand two hundred and fifty-four (7,254) completed questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate of 35.7 percent of the student body (7254/20314).

Since no question on the questionnaire was answered by all respondents, the number (N) of student respondents will differ somewhat for each question. The total College N will not equal that of all students identified by campus, as about 200 respondents tore off the identifying label on the questionnaire. These are included only in the total College N.

Chi square was used to test the statistical significance of the difference among the groups. Two levels of confidence ($p < .01$ and $p < .05$) were established for the groups depending on size. A five percent difference between groups of students consisting of approximately 1,000 individuals or more, as in the case of students divided by campus, is statistically significant at the .01 level. This means that we can be fairly certain that a five percent difference found is not by chance, and that there is a real, however small difference between groups. Most of the comparisons done in this study are among groups of this size or larger. Thus, a five percent difference will be statistically significant for most comparisons.

Larger differences are needed to reach statistical significance when comparing smaller groups of students. Groups consisting of about 400 individuals in our study are Asians, Blacks, transfers, and off-campus students. For these comparisons, about a ten percent difference is needed to reach statistical significance at the .01 level of confidence and an eight percent difference for the .05 level of confidence. Even greater differences are necessary for smaller groups included here such as Hispanics, and nonresidents.

Differences reported as statistically significant may not always have practical significance. Practical significance, or the importance of the differences, is left to the judgment of the reader.

A Comparison of Questionnaire Respondents with All Fall 1983 Students

To ascertain the representativeness of the respondents to the total student body, comparisons of respondents and the total student population on key variables were made. Information on the total student population is taken from the OIR publication, entitled, "Profile of Students Enrolled at MC during Fall Semester of 1983", and from internal records of the College. Comparison of the respondents and the fall 1983 student body on the variables of campus, full-time/part-time status, time of class attendance, residence and transfer status revealed no significant differences between groups. The percentage of respondents falling into these subgroups parallels that of the total student body. There were, however, some differences on age, sex, and minority status.

Age

Based on adjusted percentages, 62 percent of the respondents as compared to 70 percent of the fall 1983 student body were under 30 years of age. The respondents are a little older than the student body in general. The biggest discrepancy is in the 20-29 age group, which is underrepresented by five percent in our sample. This underrepresentation of younger students is similar for all campuses, and is a statistically significant difference.

Sex

Using adjusted percentages, the male student population is underrepresented in the respondents by five percent, a statistically significant difference.

Minority Status

The three groups that comprise our minority category, Asian, Black, and Hispanic students, were 15 percent of the respondents and 20 percent of the fall student body. It is primarily the Black students who are underrepresented, making up eight percent of the replies and eleven percent of the fall 1983 students.

Many students, both in the sample and in the total student population, could not be categorized by race or ethnicity. The "unknown" category is 19 percent of the sample and 17 percent of the fall 1983 student body. It is possible, of course, that some of the "unknowns" are minority students and that this group, in reality, is not underrepresented.

The minority respondents, like minorities in the total student body, are unevenly distributed among the campuses. Enrollment patterns of Black, Asian and Hispanic respondents by campus parallel that of these students in the fall 1983 student body. Sixty percent of the Black respondents were enrolled at Takoma Park, 33 percent at Rockville, and four percent at Germantown. Sixty percent of the Asian respondents were enrolled at Rockville, 30 percent at Takoma Park and three percent at Germantown. The enrollment of Hispanic respondents by campus differed slightly, but not significantly, from that of the Hispanic students enrolled in fall 1983. About two thirds of the Hispanic students were enrolled at Rockville and about one third were enrolled at Takoma Park in fall 1983. A slightly larger percentage of Hispanic survey respondents were enrolled at Rockville (68%) and a slightly smaller percentage were enrolled at the Takoma Park Campus (27%).

TABLE 1
Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students

		Respondents N = 7254			Fall 1983 Students N = 20314	
		N	%	Adj. %	N	%
Campus	Germantown	946	13	14	2397	12
	Rockville	4222	58	60	12369	61
	Takoma Park	1434	20	20	4291	21
	Off-Campus	451	6	6	1257	6
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Credits	Full-time	2005	28	28	6190	30
	Part-time	5048	70	72	14124	70
	Unknown	201	2	-		
	Total	7254	100	100%	20314	100%
Time	Day	3710	51	53	11061	54
	Evening	2383	33	34	6414	32
	Day/Eve	960	13	14	2839	14
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Residence	Montgomery Co.	6487	90	92	18424	91
	Maryland	251	3	4	819	4
	Nonresidents	315	4	4	1071	5
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Sex	Male	2758	38	39	9035	44
	Female	4295	59	61	11279	56
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%

TABLE 1 (Continued)
Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students

	Respondents N = 7254			Fall 1983 Students N = 20314		
	N	%	Adj. %	N	%	Adj. %
Age						
15-19 years	1296	18	19	4366	22	
20-29 years	2989	41	43	9808	48	
30-39 years	1322	18	19	3270	16	
40-49 years	633	9	9	1505	7	
50 and over	666	9	10	1365	7	
Unknown	348	5	-	-	-	
Total	7254	100	100	20314	100	
Race and Ethnicity						
Asian	443	6	7	1446	7	9
Black	460	6	8	1865	9	11
Hispanic	216	3	4	787	4	5
White	4654	64	79	12153	60	72
Other	138	2	2	510	3	3
Unknown	1343	19	-	3553	17	-
	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%	100%
Transfers						
1 - 15 credits	417	6		1033	5	
16 or more credits	478	7		1036	5	
	895	13%		2069	10	

STUDENT EDUCATIONAL GOALS AND REASONS FOR ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

Students were asked four questions on the topic of educational goals:

1. What is your primary reason for attending Montgomery College?
2. What is your goal while attending Montgomery College?
3. Why did you choose Montgomery College?
4. How long do you anticipate it will take you to achieve your goal at Montgomery College?

This analysis of the data obtained from the 7,254 student respondents is organized in the following way. First summaries of the responses to all four questions will be given, organized by student subgroup. The ways in which each subgroup differs from the total College norms will be pointed out. Then each answer to a given question will be analyzed in terms of the percentage of total College respondents that checked it; the range in percentages of student subgroups giving the response; and significant deviations from the total College norm on the part of student subgroups.

SUMMARY: WHY STUDENTS ATTEND MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

Total College Respondents: Primary Reason for Attending MC

The largest percentage (38%) of our total College respondents indicated that they were preparing to transfer. Three other reasons were chosen by 15 to 17 percent of the respondents: preparation for immediate career entry, interest and self-enrichment, and updating skills for career advancement. Ten percent were exploring new academic or career areas, and four percent had some other reason for attending. (N=5695, or 79% of the total College respondents)

Total College Respondents: Educational Goal While Attending MC

The largest percentage (48%) of the total College respondents checked the goal of an A.A. degree. Forty-four percent wanted to take courses and not earn a degree or certificate and eight percent wanted to earn a certificate. (N=6990, or 96% of the total College respondents)

Total College Respondents: Reasons for Choosing MC

Convenient location was a reason checked by 85 percent of the total College respondents, and low tuition and desirable programs were checked by large majorities of students. About one-third of the respondents checked reputation of the College. Small percentages (less than 15%) checked reputation of faculty and recommendations of friends, family members, or high school teachers or counselors. (N=7154, or 99% of the total College respondents)

Total College Respondents: Length of Time to Achieve Goal at MC

About one-third of the respondents declined to estimate the length of time it would take to achieve their goal. A majority of respondents who gave a time estimate thought they would achieve their goal at Montgomery College in four semesters or less, but 42 percent thought it would take more than four semesters. (N=7101, or 98% of the total College respondents)

Rockville Students

As would be expected by their numbers, (58% of the respondents), the Rockville students were similar to the total College norms regarding educational goals. The only significant difference found was the larger percentage preparing for transfer. Forty-three percent of the Rockville students gave this as their primary reason for attending Montgomery College, compared to 38 percent of the total College respondents.

Germantown Students

Germantown students differed from the total College norms in several ways. Fewer students were preparing to transfer (29%) and more students were updating skills for career advancement (21%) or attending because of interest and self-enrichment (21%). More students were taking courses without seeking a degree or certificate (48%), and a larger percentage said that convenient location was a reason for choosing Montgomery College (94%).

Takoma Park Students

More students at Takoma Park were preparing for immediate career entry (23%) and fewer were updating skills for career advancement (11%). A larger percentage wanted an A.A. degree (53%) and fewer wanted neither a degree nor a certificate (38%). More Takoma Park students indicated that the recommendation of a friend had been a reason for choosing Montgomery College (19%).

Off-Campus Students

Off-campus students differed the most from the total College norms on educational goals. The greatest number of off-campus students were attending Montgomery College to update skills for career advancement (37%). More were attending because of interest and self-enrichment (27%) and to explore new academic or career areas (16%). Fewer were preparing to transfer (11%) or for immediate career entry (6%). Two-thirds of the off-campus students wanted neither an A.A. degree nor a certificate. They were more uncertain about how long it would take to achieve their goal at Montgomery College (51%) and fewer estimated their time at Montgomery College to be three or four semesters. The main reasons for choosing Montgomery College are similar for off-campus students and total College respondents. However, items of relatively less importance to off-campus students were the reputation of the College or faculty and recommendations of friends, family or a high school teacher or counselor. Eighteen percent of the off-campus students indicated that they had some other reason for choosing Montgomery College.

Minority Students: Asian, Black and Hispanic Respondents

Minorities were more likely to be preparing to transfer (48%), and somewhat less likely to be updating skills for career advancement, exploring new academic or career areas or taking courses for interest and self-enrichment than the College norm. There are no significant differences between Asian, Black or Hispanic students on this item.

There are differences among minority students in the percent desiring an A.A. degree. Sixty-five percent of the Black, 55 percent of the Hispanic, and 46 percent of the Asian students indicated an A.A. degree to be their goal at Montgomery College. Asian and Hispanic students had greater numbers desiring a certificate (19% and 15% respectively).

Asian students were less likely to say they had chosen Montgomery College because of its convenient location. Hispanic students were more influenced by the reputation of the College and of faculty, while Asian students were less influenced by these factors. Larger percentages of minority students (18%) indicated that the recommendation of a friend had been a factor in their choice of Montgomery College, and somewhat larger percentages of Asian (9%) and Hispanic students (10%) checked "Recommended by high school teacher or counselor."

Fewer Asian students (12%), and more Hispanic students (23%) thought they would achieve their goal at Montgomery College in one or two semesters. Otherwise their time estimates are similar to those of the total College respondents.

Male and Female Students

More male students (45%) than female students (33%) indicated their primary reason for attending Montgomery College to be preparation for transfer. Females were more likely than males to check preparation for immediate career entry, interest and self enrichment, and exploration of new academic or career areas. There were no differences between males and females on goal sought while attending Montgomery College (A.A. degree, certificate or courses) or on the length of time they expected it to take. Larger percentages of female students checked, as influencing their choice of Montgomery College, convenient location (90%) and low tuition (69%).

Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students

There are several differences among students attending classes at different times as to their primary reason for attending Montgomery College. About half of the day and day/evening students were preparing to transfer, whereas only 19 percent of the evening students were preparing to transfer. The largest percentage of evening students (32%) indicated that they were updating skills for career advancement. Day and day/evening students were more likely to be preparing for immediate career entry (21%) than evening students (10%).

Almost two-thirds of the day/evening students indicated their goal at Montgomery College to be an A.A. degree. This compares to 48 percent of the day students and 40 percent of the evening students. Evening students were more likely to desire neither a degree nor a certificate, but to want to complete desired courses instead.

Evening students were more uncertain about how long it would take to achieve their goal at Montgomery College, but of those that made an estimate, 46 percent thought it would take five or six or more semesters. Day students were more likely to think they would finish in three or four semesters.

On the question about reasons for choosing to attend Montgomery College, students grouped by time of class attendance differed in several ways. Convenient location was more important to evening students. Low tuition was more important to day/evening students, and the recommendation of a friend was more important to day students and day/evening students then was characteristic of the student population in general.

Full-Time and Part-Time Students

Full-time students were much more likely than part-time students to say their primary reason for attending Montgomery College was to prepare to transfer (68% vs. 24%). Significantly larger percentages of part-time students were exploring new academic or career areas, updating skills for career advancement, or attending because of interest and self-enrichment. Fifty-nine percent of the full-time students, compared to 43 percent of the part-time students, wanted to earn an A.A. degree. A larger percentage of the part-time respondents indicated they were taking courses and earning neither a degree nor a certificate (49% vs. 32%).

Part-time students were more uncertain about how long it would take to achieve their goal at Montgomery College. Full-time students were more likely to estimate a time period of three or four semesters at Montgomery College, while part-time students were more likely to think it would take five or six or more semesters.

There are significant differences between full and part-time students in their reasons for choosing Montgomery College. The reputation of the College, the recommendations of family and of a high school teacher or counselor were important to greater numbers of full-time students. Convenient location was important to more part-time students.

Transfer Students

Forty-five percent of the students who had transferred 1-15 credits to Montgomery College said their primary reason for attending Montgomery College was to prepare to transfer to a four-year institution. Only 31 percent of those who had transferred 16 or more credits to Montgomery College gave this reason for attendance. Exploration of new academic or career areas was given as the reason for attending by a larger percentage of transfers with 16 or more credits. Transfers with 1-15 credits had the highest percentage (72%) of any subgroup desiring to earn an A.A. degree. Transfers with 16 or more credits also had a larger percentage (63%) wanting to earn a degree.

Those with more credits estimated a shorter time at Montgomery College to achieve their goal, while 47 percent of those who had transferred 1-15 credits thought it would take five or six or more semesters. Transfer students' reasons for choosing Montgomery College paralled those of the total College respondents.

Montgomery County, Maryland, and Nonresident Students

Nonresident students had a larger percentage (56%) indicating preparation for transfer as their primary reason for attending Montgomery College. Maryland (non-county) residents had more students updating skills for career advancement (25%). Fewer Maryland residents and nonresidents were taking courses for interest and self-enrichment, or to explore new academic or career areas. The goals of Maryland residents and nonresidents while attending Montgomery College were similar to those of the Montgomery County residents. Smaller percentages of the Maryland residents and nonresidents expected it to take as long as five or more semesters to achieve their goal at Montgomery College.

As might be expected, fewer Maryland residents and nonresidents chose Montgomery College because of its convenient location or because of low tuition, although those reasons remain in the top three for this group of students. "Offers desired programs" is the other reason in the top three for all these students. Twenty-five percent of the nonresidents checked "Recommended by a friend", the largest number of any group of students giving this reason for choosing Montgomery College.

GROUP COMPARISONS ON EACH QUESTION

This section of the report analyzes the data by question, giving the range in percentages of student subgroups that gave each response to the question. Significant deviations from the total College norms are pointed out.

Primary Reason for Attending Montgomery College

Students were asked to check one of six reasons for attending Montgomery College. The reasons are presented in order of the percentage of total College respondents that checked it. The reason with the highest number of responses Collegewide is presented first.

1) Preparation for transfer: Thirty-eight percent (38%) of the total College respondents chose this as as their primary reason for attending Montgomery College. The subgroup percentages range from 68 percent of the full-time students to 11 percent of the off-campus students. Groups with higher percentages than the College norm indicating preparation for transfer as their primary reason are: full-time students (68%), nonresidents (56%), day/evening students (52%), minorities (48%), day students (45%), transfer students with 1-15 credits (45%), males (45%), and Rockville students (43%). The groups with significantly smaller percentages are: off-campus students (11%), evening students (19%), part-time students (24%), Germantown students (29%), and females (33%).

2) Preparation for immediate entry into a career: Seventeen percent of the total College respondents chose this as their primary reason for attending Montgomery College. The percentages ranged from 23 percent of the transfer students and Takoma Park students to six percent of the off-campus students. Day/evening students (22%), along with the transfer students (23%) and Takoma Park students (23%), had greater percentages than the College norm preparing for immediate career entry. Two groups had significantly smaller proportions of students checking this reason: evening students (10%), and off-campus students (6%).

3) Interest and self-enrichment: Sixteen percent of the total College respondents checked this as their primary reason for attending MC. The percentages ranged from a high of 27 percent of the off-campus students to a low of three percent of the full-time students. Groups with greater percentages then the College norm attending for this reason were: off-campus students (27%), part-time students (23%), Germantown students (21%), and evening students (20%). Groups with considerably smaller percentages attending for interest or self-enrichment were: full-time students (3%), Maryland residents (5%), nonresidents (7%), day/evening students (9%), and transfers students (11%).

4) Update skills for career advancement: Fifteen percent of the total College respondents checked this as their primary reason for attending Montgomery College. The percentages ranged from a high of 37 percent of

the off-campus students to a low of two percent of the full-time students. Groups with greater percentages than the College norm attending to update skills were: evening students (32%), Maryland residents (25%), part-time students (20%), Germantown students (21%), and off-campus students (37%). Those with significantly smaller percentages were: minorities (10%), day students (7%), day/evening students (8%), full-time students (2%) and Takoma Park students (11%).

5) Explore new academic or career areas: Ten percent of the total College respondents checked this as their primary reason for attendance. The percentages ranged from a high of 16 percent of the off-campus students to a low of five percent of full-time students, Maryland residents, and of those transferring in 1-15 credits. Transfers with 16 or more credits, evening students, and part-time students all had somewhat greater percentages than the College norm exploring new academic or career areas.

6) Other: Four percent of the total College respondents indicated they had some other primary reason for attendance. There were no differences among subgroups of students.

Educational Goal while Attending Montgomery College

Respondents were asked to indicate their goal while attending Montgomery College. Their responses were:

1) Earn an associate degree: Forty-eight percent of the total College respondents chose this goal. The percentages of respondents choosing this goal ranged from a high of 72 percent of the transfer students with 1-15 credits to a low of 28 percent of the off-campus students. Groups of students with greater percentages of A.A. degree aspirants than the College norm were: all transfer students (68%), Black students (65%), Hispanic students (55%), day/evening students (63%), full-time students (59%), and Takoma Park students (53%). Only the part-time students, with 43 percent desiring to earn an A.A. degree, and the off-campus students, had significantly fewer degree aspirants than the College norm.

2) Complete desired courses, not earn a degree or certificate: Forty-four percent of the total College respondents chose this goal. The percentages ranged from 67 percent of the off-campus students to 28 percent of the transfers students. Groups of students with greater percentages indicating disinterest in a degree or certificate than the College norm were: off-campus students (67%), evening students (53%), part-time students (49%), and Germantown students (48%). Groups with significanlty smaller percentages citing this educational goal were transfer students (28%), Black students (27%), Hispanic students (30%), day/evening students (31%), and full-time students (32%).

3) Earn a certificate: Eight percent of the total College respondents chose this goal. The percentages ranged from 19 percent of the Asian students to four percent of the transfer students. Groups of students with greater numbers of certificate aspirants than the College norm were: Asian students (19%), Hispanic students (15%) and nonresidents (12%). No group had significantly smaller percentages of certificate aspirants.

Reasons for Choosing Montgomery College

Respondents were asked to check all the reasons on the list that influenced their choice of Montgomery College. "Convenient location" was the item most often checked by all subgroups of students, and "recommended by high school teacher or counselor" was the item least often checked. Four of the reasons on the list stand out as the ones considered most important by every subgroup of our student respondents: convenient location, low tuition, desired programs, and reputation of College.

The reasons are presented below in order of the percentage of total College respondents indicating the item as the reason for attending Montgomery College.

1) Convenient location: Eighty-five percent of the total College respondents checked this reason. The percentages ranged from 94 percent of the Germantown students to 59 percent of the nonresidents. It was more important to larger percentages of Germantown (94%), part-time (90%), females (90%) and evening students (93%). Conversely,

comparatively smaller percentages of nonresidents (59%), full-time students (77%), minority students (80%), especially Asian students (75%), checked this as a reason for choosing Montgomery College.

2) Low tuition: Sixty-five percent of the total College respondents checked this item. This was the second most important reason for choosing Montgomery College for all but off-campus students and those Black students not living in Montgomery County. The percentages ranged from a high of 73 percent for day/evening students and those who transferred 16 or more credits to Montgomery College to a low of 26 percent for Maryland residents.

3) Offers desired programs: Sixty-three percent of the total College respondents checked this reason. The subgroup percentages ranged from 71 percent of the transfer students with 16 or more credits to 48 percent of the nonresidents. This was the second most important reason for choosing Montgomery College for off-campus students, Black students, Maryland and nonresident students.

4) Reputation of College: Thirty-two percent of the total College respondents checked this reason. The subgroup percentages ranged from a high of 45 percent of the Hispanic students to 23 percent of the Asian and off-campus students.

5) Recommended by a friend: Fourteen percent of the total College respondents checked this reason for choosing Montgomery College. The subgroup percentages ranged from a high of 25 percent of the nonresident students to a low of six percent of the off-campus students. Takoma Park, minority and day students were more likely to check this reason than were students enrolled on the other campuses or evening or nonminority students.

6) Reputation of faculty: Twelve percent of total College respondents checked this reason. The subgroup percentages ranged from a high of 17 percent of the Hispanics to a low of five percent of the off-campus students.

7) Recommended by family members: Twelve percent of the total College respondents checked this reason. The percentages ranged from a high of twenty-one percent of the full-time students to a low of four percent of the off-campus students.

8) Recommended by high school teacher or counselor: Six percent of the total College respondents checked this reason for attending Montgomery College. The percentages of students ranged from 12 percent of the full-time students to one percent of the off-campus students and one percent of the transfer students. Asian (9%) and Hispanic students (10%) were somewhat more likely to check this than nonminorities (5%).

Length of Time for Achievement of Goals at Montgomery College

Respondents were asked, "How long do you anticipate it will take you to achieve your goal at Montgomery College?" They could respond by checking one, two, three, four, five, or six or more semesters, or by checking "Don't know." The largest percentage (34%) of total College respondents indicated that they didn't know how long it would take. When these uncertain respondents are eliminated, the responses are dispersed throughout the "one" to "six semester" choices, with the largest percentage (28%) for "six or more semesters," and the smallest (10%) for "three semesters."

The student subgroups showed varying degrees of uncertainty with percentages checking "Don't know" ranging from 51 percent of the off-campus students to 15 percent of the full-time students. Other groups of respondents that had high percentages of uncertain students were evening students (44%) and part-time students (41%). Groups with fewer uncertain students were transfer students (24%), day/evening students (20%), nonresidents (25%), and full-time students (15%).

Expected Time Eliminating the "Don't know" Responses

While the majority of respondents in all groups of students expected to achieve their goal at Montgomery College in four semesters or less, it is striking to note the large numbers of students that expected it to take longer than four semesters. Forty percent or more of all but two subgroups of students expected it to take five, six or more semesters. The two subgroups with smaller percentages thinking it would take that long are the transfer students with 16 or more credits and the students not living in Montgomery County.

1) One or two semesters: Twenty-eight percent of the total College respondents checked one of these two responses. The percentages ranged from 35 percent of the off-campus students to 19 percent of the Asian students. Groups with larger percentages expecting to finish in one or two semesters were: off-campus students (35%), transfer students with 16 or more credits (31%), Hispanics (31%) and Maryland and nonresident students (34%).

2) Three or four semesters: Thirty percent of the total College respondents checked one of these two responses. The percentages ranged from 39 percent of the full-time students to 25 percent of the off-campus and evening students. The only differences among subgroups were between full-time and part-time students and between day and evening students. Full-time and day students were more likely to expect to finish in three or four semesters.

3) Five or six or more semesters: Forty-two percent of the total College respondents checked one of these two responses. The percentages range from 47 percent of those transferring 1-15 credits to 34 percent of those not residing in Montgomery County. Forty-six percent of the evening students and 44 percent of the part-time students expected it to take five or more semesters to achieve their goal at Montgomery College.

CONCLUSION

All student groups had a variety of reasons for attending Montgomery College. Students enrolled on the different campuses were not very different in their reasons for attendance. Substantial numbers were preparing to transfer, updating skills for career advancement, or attending because of interest. While more Takoma Park students were preparing for immediate career entry, this was still sought by only 23 percent of those students.

The two reasons for attending Montgomery College that varied the most among student groups were preparation for transfer and updating skills for career advancement. Groups with fewer students preparing to transfer tended to have more updating skills (i.e. the off-campus students and evening students). On the other hand, the percentages of students preparing for immediate career entry or exploring new academic or career areas did not vary much among student groups, and were cited by no more than 23 percent of any student group.

Two groups of students, full-time students and day/evening students, were less diverse than others in their reasons for attending Montgomery College. Most of these students were preparing to transfer or were preparing for immediate career entry, the two reasons given by 88 percent of the full-time students and by 74 percent of the day/evening students.

Comparisons of students by campus did not reveal substantial differences in the percentages of A.A. degree aspirants or of those desiring neither a degree nor a certificate. However, other student subgroups did differ considerably on this issue. The A.A. degree was the educational goal of 72 percent of the students who had transferred 1-15 credits to Montgomery College, but the goal of only 28 percent of the off-campus students. About two-thirds of the Black students and day/evening students desired to earn the A.A. degree.

Students chose Montgomery College because of its convenient location, low tuition, desirable programs, and reputation. The other reasons on the list, the recommendations of friends, family members, high school teachers or counselors, and the reputation of the faculty were never cited by more than 25 percent of any student group. The recommendation of a high school teacher or counselor was the least often cited reason for choosing Montgomery College. Since respondents could check as many reasons as were applicable, this is perhaps of special interest. It could be beneficial to investigate the reasons why this was mentioned so infrequently.

One conclusion to be drawn from the data on time estimates given by respondents is that for many students, Montgomery College is not a two-year college. Of those that made an estimate of their time at Montgomery College, between one-third and one-half of all student groups expected to be attending classes at Montgomery College for more than two years. Of the part-time students, who make up 70 percent of the student body, 44 percent gave estimates of that length of time.

APPENDIX

Tables		Page
1-4	Total College and Students by Campus.	24
5-8	Asian, Black and Hispanic Students	26
9-12	Male and Female Students.	27
13-16	Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students	28
17-20	Full-Time and Part-Time Students.	29
21-24	Students Transferring Credits to MC	30
25-28	Montgomery County, Maryland, and Nonresident Students.	31

TOTAL COLLEGE AND STUDENTS BY CAMPUS

TABLE 1
PRIMARY REASON FOR ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Total College		German-town 745	Rock-ville 3369	Takoma Park 1176	Off-Campus 334
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Explore new academic or career areas	572	10	12	9	10	16
Preparation for immediate entry into a career	967	17	13	17	23	6
Preparation for transfer to a four-year institution	2176	38	29	43	37	11
Update skills for career advancement	831	15	21	12	11	37
Interest and self-enrichment	938	16	21	15	15	27
Other	211	4	4	4	4	3
Total	5695	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 2
GOAL WHILE ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Total College		German-town 927	Rock-ville 4128	Takoma Park 1405	Off-Campus 445
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Complete desired courses not earn a degree or certificate	3093	44	48	43	38	67
Earn a certificate	550	8	6	8	9	5
Earn an associate degree	3347	48	46	49	53	28
Total	6990	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TOTAL COLLEGE AND STUDENTS BY CAMPUS

TABLE 3
LENGTH OF TIME TO ACHIEVE GOAL AT MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Total College		Germantown 940	Rockville 4199	Takoma Park 1430	Off-Campus 453
	N	%	%	%	%	%
1 or 2 semesters	1291	18	17	19	17	17
3 or 4 semesters	1454	21	19	21	21	12
5 or more semesters	1961	27	27	29	28	20
Don't know	2401	34	37	31	34	51
Total	7107	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 4
REASONS FOR CHOOSING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE**

	Total College		Germantown 946	Rockville 4222	Takoma Park 1434	Off-Campus 451
	N**	%	%	%	%	%
Low tuition	4671	65	62	67	64	59
Convenient location	6049	85	95	82	83	86
Desired programs	4489	63	61	62	64	64
Reputation of College	2272	32	28	33	34	23
Recommended by friend	1031	14	12	14	19	6
Reputation of faculty	848	12	10	13	11	5
Recommended by family	844	12	10	14	10	4
Recommended by High school teacher/counselor	419	6	4	7	4	1
Other	737	10	8	10	10	18
All of the above	6	*	0	*	*	*

N** = 7154

* Less than one percent.

**Respondents could check more than one response.

ASIAN, BLACK AND HISPANIC STUDENTS

TABLE 5
PRIMARY REASON FOR ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Asian		Black		Hispanic		Total	
	N = 398	%	369	%	174	%	941	%
Explore new areas		6%		8%		9%		7%
Immediate career entry		19%		20%		20%		20%
Preparation for transfer		49%		47%		48%		48%
Update skills for career		8%		12%		9%		10%
Interest and self-enrichment		14%		10%		12%		12%
Other		4%		3%		2%		3%
Total		100%		100%		100%		100%

TABLE 6
GOAL WHILE ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Asian		Black		Hispanic		Total	
	N = 432	%	446	%	213	%	N 1091	%
Complete desired courses only		35%		27%		30%		31%
Earn a certificate		19%		8%		15%		14%
Earn an associate degree		46%		65%		55%		55%
Total		100%		100%		100%		100%

TABLE 7
LENGTH OF TIME TO ACHIEVE GOAL AT MONTGOMERY COLLEGE?

	Asian		Black		Hispanic		Total	
	N = 443	%	460	%	216	%	N 1119	%
One or two semesters		12%		18%		23%		16%
Three or four semesters		21%		21%		21%		21%
Five or more semesters		29%		30%		28%		29%
Don't know		38%		31%		28%		34%
Total		100%		100%		100%		100%

TABLE 8
REASONS FOR CHOOSING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE**

	Asian		Black		Hispanic		Total	
	N=443	%	460	%	216	%	1119	%
Low tuition		55%		53%		55%	608	54%
Convenient location		75%		82%		78%	877	78%
Offers desired programs		46%		60%		52%	594	53%
Reputation of College		23%		37%		45%	370	33%
Recommended by friend		18%		17%		18%	197	18%
Reputation of faculty		10%		10%		17%	126	11%
Recommended by family members		16%		10%		13%	147	13%
Recommended by high school teacher/counselor		9%		6%		10%	88	8%
Other		6%		7%		6%	70	6%
All of the above		0%		*		0%	1	*

* Less than one percent

**Respondents could indicate more than one response

MALE AND FEMALE STUDENTS

TABLE 9
PRIMARY REASON FOR ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Male N=2276	Female 3348
	%	%
Explore new areas	8	12
Immediate career entry	14	19
Preparation for transfer	45	33
Update skills for career	16	14
Interest and self-enrichment	14	15
Other	3	4
Total	100%	100%

TABLE 10
GOAL WHILE ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Male N=2729	Female 4177
	%	%
Complete desired courses only	44	44
Earn a certificate	7	8
Earn an associate degree	49	48
Total	100%	100%

TABLE 11
LENGTH AND TIME TO ACHIEVE GOAL AT MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Male N=2741	Female 4281
	%	%
One or two semesters	19	17
Three or four semesters	22	20
Five or more semesters	29	27
Don't know	30	36
Total	100%	100%

TABLE 12
REASONS FOR CHOOSING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE**

	Male N=2727	Female 4157
	%	%
Low tuition	63	69
Convenient location	82	90
Offers desired programs	62	66
Reputation of College	31	34
Recommended by friend	13	16
Reputation of faculty	12	13
Recommended by family members	13	12
Recommended by high school teacher/counselor	7	5
All of the above	10	11

* Less than one percent

**Respondents could indicate more than one response

DAY, EVENING AND DAY/EVENING STUDENTS

TABLE 13
PRIMARY REASON FOR ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Day	Eve	Day/Eve
	N= 3091	1788	745
	%	%	%
Explore new areas	8	15	7
Immediate career entry	20	10	22
Preparation for transfer	45	19	52
Update skills for career	7	32	8
Interest and self-enrichment	16	20	9
Other	4	4	2
Total	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 14
GOAL WHILE ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Day	Eve	Day/Eve
	N= 3618	2349	939
	%	%	%
Complete desired courses only	42	53	31
Earn a certificate	9	7	6
Earn an associate degree	48	40	63
Total	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 15
LENGTH OF TIME TO ACHIEVE GOAL AT MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Day	Eve	Day/Eve
	N= 3684	2375	963
	%	%	%
One or two semester	19	16	20
Three or four semesters	23	14	25
Five or more semesters	27	26	36
Don't know	31	44	20
Total	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 16
REASONS FOR CHOOSING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE**

	Day	Eve	Day/Eve
	N=3646	2348	936
	%	%	%
Low tuition	65	67	73
Convenient location	83	93	86
Offers desired programs	62	67	63
Reputation of College	35	27	36
Recommended by friend	18	10	16
Reputation of faculty	15	8	13
Recommended by family members	15	7	14
Recommended by high school teacher/counselor	9	2	5
Other	12	9	10
All of the above	*	*	0

* Less than one percent

**Respondents could indicate more than one response

FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME STUDENTS

TABLE 17
PRIMARY REASON FOR ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Full-Time N= 1744 %	Part-Time 3880 %
Explore new areas	5	13
Immediate career entry	20	15
Preparation for transfer	68	24
Update skills for career	2	20
Interest and self-enrichment	3	23
Other	2	5
Total	100%	100%

TABLE 18
GOAL WHILE ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Full-Time N= 1980 %	Part-Time 4926 %
Complete desired courses only	32	49
Earn a certificate	9	8
Earn an associate degree	59	43
Total	100%	100%

TABLE 19
LENGTH OF TIME TO ACHIEVE GOAL AT MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Full-Time N= 1994 %	Part-Time 5028 %
One or two semesters	19	18
Three or four semesters	34	15
Five or more semesters	32	26
Don't know	15	41
Total	100%	100%

TABLE 20
REASONS FOR CHOOSING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE**

	Full-Time N=1985 %	Part-Time 4944 %
Low tuition	66	67
Convenient location	77	90
Offers desired programs	56	67
Reputation of College	38	31
Recommended by friend	18	14
Reputation of faculty	13	12
Recommended by family members	21	9
Recommended by high school teacher/counselor	12	4
Other	12	10
All of the above	*	*

* Less than one percent
**Respondents could indicate more than one response

STUDENTS TRANSFERRING CREDITS TO MC

TABLE 21
PRIMARY REASON FOR ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	Credits Transferred		
	1 - 15 N= 334	16 and above 362	Total 696
	%	%	%
Explore new areas	5	15	10
Immediate career entry	25	22	23
Preparation for transfer	45	31	38
Update skills for career	14	17	16
Interest and self-enrichment	9	12	11
Other	2	3	2
Total	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 22
GOAL WHILE ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	1 - 15 N= 408	16 and above 462	Total 870
	%	%	%
Complete desired courses only	23	33	28
Earn a certificate	5	4	4
Earn an associate degree	72	63	68
Total	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 23
LENGTH OF TIME TO ACHIEVE GOAL AT MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	1 - 15 N= 412	16 and above 469	Total 881
	%	%	%
One or two semesters	18	24	21
Three or four semesters	24	26	24
Five or more semesters	36	26	31
Don't know	22	24	24
Total	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 24
REASONS FOR CHOOSING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	1 - 15 N= 414	16 and above 469	Total 883
	%	%	%
Low tuition	69	73	71
Convenient location	87	89	88
Offers desired programs	65	71	68
Reputation of College	35	35	35
Recommended by friend	13	10	11
Reputation of faculty	14	13	13
Recommended by family members	9	7	8
Recommended by high school teacher/counselor	2	1	1
Other	7	11	9
All of the above	0	*	*

* Less than one percent

**Respondents could indicate more than one response

TABLE 25
PRIMARY REASON FOR ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	MC	MD	NR
	N= 5131	207	286
	%	%	%
Explore new areas	10	5	8
Immediate career entry	17	21	14
Preparation for transfer	37	41	56
Update skills for career	14	25	11
Interest and self-enrichment	18	5	7
Other	4	3	4
Total	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 26
GOAL WHILE ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

	MC	MD	NR
	N= 6337	252	317
	%	%	%
Complete desired courses only	45	41	38
Earn a certificate	8	9	12
Earn an associate degree	47	50	50
Total	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 27
LENGTH OF TIME TO ACHIEVE GOAL AT MONTGOMERY COLLEGE?

	MC	MD	NR
	N= 6444	259	319
	%	%	%
One or two semesters	18	22	26
Three or four semesters	20	22	24
Five or more semesters	28	24	25
Don't know	34	32	25
Total	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 28
REASONS FOR CHOOSING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE**

	MC	MD	NR
	N=6335	251	315
	%	%	%
Low tuition	70	26	33
Convenient location	89	67	59
Offers desired programs	65	60	48
Reputation of College	33	25	29
Recommended by friend	14	13	25
Reputation of faculty	13	9	7
Recommended by family members	12	10	12
Recommended by high school teacher/counselor	6	5	5
Other	10	18	11
All of the above	*	*	0

* Less than one percent

**Respondents could indicate more than one response

Current Student Survey Report
Part 3: Student Preferences on Class Scheduling

Montgomery College
Office of Institutional Research
Montgomery County, Maryland
February 1985

MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY REPORT
PART 3: STUDENT PREFERENCES ON CLASS SCHEDULING

February 1985

Office of Institutional Research
William E. Campbell, Director
Kathy Rose, Research Analyst II
Marcia Scott, Research Analyst I
Marilynn P. Smith, Administrative Associate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Executive Summary iii

Introduction: Current Student Survey. 1

List of Tables. 7

Student Preferences on Class Scheduling

Introduction 8

Total College: Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students 9

Germantown: Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students. 12

Rockville: Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students 14

Takoma Park: Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students 16

Off-Campus Students: Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students . 18

Full-Time and Part-Time Students 20

Minorities: Asian, Black and Hispanic Students 22

Transfer Students. 24

Montgomery County, Maryland, and Nonresidents. 26

Males and Females. 28

Comparison of Student Subgroups by Question

Most Convenient Time for Classes 30

Least Convenient Time for Classes. 31

Preferred Schedule for a Three Credit Course 32

A Television Course. 33

Conclusion. 34

Appendix A. 36

Appendix B. 45

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Title: Current Student Survey
Part 3: Student Preferences on Class Scheduling

Purpose: This report presents information, obtained by a questionnaire from students enrolled at Montgomery College in fall 1983, on their preferences regarding time for classes, semester length, number of classes per week, and duration of each class session. It also presents information on their willingness to take a course by television. The information should be useful to all those engaged in the scheduling of courses at Montgomery College.

Methodology: A questionnaire was sent during the month of November, 1983 to all students enrolled in credit courses on and off-campus. Those students not responding were sent a follow-up questionnaire. The response rate was 35.7 percent of the student body (7,254/20,314). The respondents are proportionally representative of the fall student body on campus of enrollment, full-time/part-time status, time of class attendance, residence and credits transferred to Montgomery College. Somewhat underrepresented in the respondents are students under 30 years of age, males and minorities.

The data has been analyzed by campus and time of class attendance, by full-time/part-time status, by racial/ethnic status, by credits transferred, by residence and by sex. Statistically significant differences are reported; i.e., those that reach the .01 or .05 level of confidence. Also included in the Appendix are summaries of the responses pertaining to scheduling given by the respondents in answer to an open-ended question on desired programs or services.

Limitations: The questionnaire was not sent to students who were enrolled only in the mini-semester, thus the number of students preferring an eight week semester may be smaller than it would have been if the mini-session only students had been included in the sample. The underrepresentation of younger students, males and minorities will affect the total College and campus summary statistics somewhat.

Findings: Student preferences on class scheduling were strongly related to two factors: full-time or part-time status and the time of class attendance. No other factor was so strongly related to scheduling preferences. Comparison of students by campus, sex, minority status, residence and by credits transferred to Montgomery College revealed only minor differences among these groups of students regarding the time considered most convenient for classes and the preferred number and duration of classes per week.

Full-time students and day students were in agreement that morning was the most convenient time for classes. It was the time preferred by 85 percent of the full-time students and by 80 percent of the day students. Afternoon classes were preferred by 12 to 13 percent of each of these student groups, and evening classes were preferred by only three to four percent. There were no significant differences on this issue for day students enrolled at the Germantown, Rockville, or Takoma Park campuses. The fifty-eight off-campus day students, however, did not follow this pattern. Between 25 to 30 percent of these students favored each possible time: morning, afternoon or evening.

For both full-time students and day students, the most favored schedule for a typical three credit course was to meet three times a week in one hour class periods over a 15 week semester. This was true of day students at the Germantown and Rockville campuses. Day students at Takoma Park had equal percentages (40%) favoring a twice a week and a three times a week schedule. Off-campus day students, however, strongly favored classes meeting twice a week (60%) over those meeting three times a week (4%).

Weekend was the time most often considered least convenient for classes by full-time students, day students, and day/evening students on all campuses and at off-campus locations. A larger percentage of Germantown respondents, compared to Rockville and Takoma Park respondents, considered weekends least convenient for classes. Evening students had the smallest percentage of any student category who chose the weekend as least desirable time for classes.

The class scheduling preferences of the part-time students were very different from those of the full-time students. A majority of the part-time students considered evening the most convenient time for classes, and 35 percent considered morning as most convenient. Whereas 63 percent of full-time students preferred classes meeting three times a week, only 17 percent of the part-time students favored this schedule. More part-time students favored classes meeting once or twice a week; about one-third of the part-time students favored each of these schedules. There was no strong consensus on the least convenient time for classes by part-time students; between 18 percent and 33 percent rejected each time, (morning, afternoon, evening or weekend).

Evening students showed a rare unanimity in their choice of the most convenient time for classes. Between 93 percent and 96 percent of the evening students enrolled on each campus and off-campus preferred classes in the evening.

The schedule preferred by 55 percent of all evening students for a typical three credit course is for a three hour class meeting once a week for 15 weeks. More evening students on all campuses and at off-campus locations preferred this schedule to any other. It was especially favored by the off-campus and Germantown Campus evening students. The second most popular schedule for a three credit course was that with one and one-half hour classes meeting twice a week for 15 weeks. This was the choice of between 15 to 39 percent of the evening students on all campuses and at off-campus centers.

Day/evening students preferred morning or evening classes. This was true of the day/evening students on all campuses, with morning classes favored by larger percentages of these students than evening classes. Weekends were considered the least convenient time for classes by the largest percentage of day/evening students on all campuses. There was no consensus among day/evening students regarding the best schedule for a three credit course. It is probable that these students needed two choices, one for day and one for evening classes. At the Rockville Campus more day/evening students favored classes meeting two or three times a week than those meeting once a week. At the Germantown and Takoma Park campuses, the day/evening students indicated no strong preferences among the three choices, with between 25 to 36 percent favoring each suggested schedule within a 15 week semester.

Afternoon Classes

Only nine percent of all respondents chose afternoon as the most convenient time for classes. The range in percentages of students preferring this time was very small, from highs of 16 percent of the day/evening students at the Rockville Campus and fourteen percent of all day/evening students to a low of one percent of the evening students.

Although afternoon classes were clearly not preferred, interestingly enough, they were also least often selected as the time at which the student could not attend classes. The range in percentages of students rejecting afternoon classes was small, from 18 percent to nine percent. However, this question on the least convenient time for classes was answered by only one third of the respondents.

Weekend Classes

Only two percent of the respondents preferred weekend classes. The highest percentage (5%) favoring weekends was given by the off-campus students. The weekend was the most rejected time for classes. It was chosen by 41 percent of the respondents as the time they could not attend class. Evening students had the smallest percentage (22%) rejecting weekend classes, but only 18 percent of the evening students answered the question.

The Eight Week Semester

Only 503 individuals, or eight percent of the respondents preferred an eight week semester. Since the students who were enrolled only in the fall 1983 mini-semester did not receive the questionnaire, it is possible that our findings underestimate the number who might be receptive to an eight week semester. Student groups with the highest percentages (11%) favoring this schedule for a three credit course were day/evening students at the Takoma Park Campus and transfer students with 16 or more credits. Almost all students preferring the eight week semester favored meeting twice a week for three hour class sessions.

TV Courses

Although very few of the respondents had ever taken a course through TV, (about five percent of most student groups), there was widespread interest among all students in taking a course through TV. About 40 percent of most student groups responded positively to the idea. Student groups with even larger percentages receptive to taking such a course were Black students, Hispanic students, day/evening students, and Maryland residents.

Discussion: The findings of this study suggest that it would be desirable to expand the percentage of courses offered in the morning and in the evening since approximately 90 percent of the respondents on each campus and at off-campus locations preferred morning or evening classes. However, this cannot be done easily on any campus, given the limitations of space and available faculty. It would probably be difficult to expand the number of evening courses at the Germantown campus, and very difficult to increase the number of morning course offerings at the Rockville and Takoma Park campuses. This preference for morning and evening class times, a preference discovered before in other research studies, does suggest that efforts should be made to make optimal use of the facilities available at these times.

The responses to the question on the preferred schedule for a typical three credit course primarily reinforce current practices, i.e., most day-time classes meet two or three times a week for 15 weeks, and most evening classes meet once or twice a week for 15 weeks. The once a week schedule was preferred by more evening students, and perhaps more night classes could be scheduled to meet once a week than is current practice. Variations among the campuses on this issue are worth noting.

It is possible that the key to expanding the number of weekend and mini-semester students is discovering the specific courses desired by students at those times. Appendix A contains a summary of course requests by time from the respondents in answer to an open-ended question on programs and services desired. A detailed listing of courses requested is available from the Office of Institutional Research.

Courses in computer science and the business and management areas were most frequently requested by Germantown students. Courses in art, engineering and engineering technology, computer science, physical education and foreign language were most frequently requested by Rockville students. Courses in medical subjects and the natural sciences were most frequently requested by the Takoma Park students. However, students on each campus requested courses in almost every subject area taught at Montgomery College, and also in many areas not taught at the College. The summaries in the Appendix do not reveal the creativity shown by many students who responded to this question, but they do reveal the wide diversity in student interests. Most of the course requests did not specify a time of day desired; however, evening was the most requested time on all campuses.

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The Current Student Survey is one of five components of a Community Assessment Program study being conducted by the College's Office of Institutional Research. The purpose of the Current Student Survey is to find out from currently enrolled students their opinions on the quality of College programs, services and facilities; their perception and knowledge of the College; their educational goals and expectations; their preferences on class scheduling; their use of the media; and a number of demographic factors. The data will be used to determine how well the College is meeting the educational needs of its students and how to better communicate with them.

The reports on the Current Student Survey will be issued in several parts based on the following topics:

1. Student Evaluation of Montgomery College
2. Educational Goals and Reasons for Attending MC
3. Knowledge about Montgomery College
4. Media Use
5. Preferences on Class Scheduling
6. Demographics
7. Open-ended responses

It was thought important to find out if there are differences in the opinions and needs of several subgroups in the student population. Therefore, the data obtained will be analyzed so as to compare the responses of the following student groups: students enrolled at the different campuses and at off-campus locations; students attending in the day, evening and day/evening; students enrolled full-time and part-time; males and females; Asian, Black, and Hispanic students; students who have transferred to Montgomery College; and Montgomery County residents, Maryland residents, and nonresidents.

Methodology

In the fall semester of 1983, 20,314 students were enrolled in credit courses on all three campuses and at off-campus locations. All students were sent a questionnaire during the month of November, 1983, and those not responding were sent a follow-up questionnaire. Seven thousand two hundred and fifty-four (7,254) completed questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate of 35.7 percent of the student body (7254/20314).

Since no question on the questionnaire was answered by all respondents, the number (N) of student respondents will differ somewhat for each question. The total College N will not equal that of all students identified by campus, as about 200 respondents tore off the identifying label on the questionnaire. These are included only in the total College N.

Chi square was used to test the statistical significance of the difference among the groups. Two levels of confidence ($p < .01$ and $p < .05$) were established for the groups depending on size. A five percent difference between groups of students consisting of approximately 1,000 individuals or more, as in the case of students divided by campus, is statistically significant at the .01 level. This means that we can be fairly certain that a five percent difference found is not by chance, and that there is a real, however small difference between groups. Most of the comparisons done in this study are among groups of this size or larger. Thus, a five percent difference will be statistically significant for most comparisons.

Larger differences are needed to reach statistical significance when comparing smaller groups of students. Groups consisting of about 400 individuals in our study are Asians, Blacks, transfers, and off-campus students. For these comparisons, about a ten percent difference is needed to reach statistical significance at the .01 level of confidence and an eight percent difference for the .05 level of confidence. Even greater differences are necessary for smaller groups included here such as Hispanics, and nonresidents.

Differences reported as statistically significant may not always have practical significance. Practical significance, or the importance of the differences, is left to the judgment of the reader.

A Comparison of Questionnaire Respondents with All Fall 1983 Students

To ascertain the representativeness of the respondents to the total student body, comparisons of respondents and the total student population on key variables were made. Information on the total student population is taken from the OIR publication, entitled, "Profile of Students Enrolled at MC during Fall Semester of 1983", and from internal records of the College. Comparison of the respondents and the fall 1983 student body on the variables of campus, full-time/part-time status, time of class attendance, residence and transfer status revealed no significant differences between groups. The percentage of respondents falling into these subgroups parallels that of the total student body. There were, however, some differences on age, sex, and minority status.

Age

Based on adjusted percentages, 62 percent of the respondents as compared to 70 percent of the fall 1983 student body were under 30 years of age. The respondents are a little older than the student body in general. The biggest discrepancy is in the 20-29 age group, which is underrepresented by five percent in our sample. This underrepresentation of younger students is similar for all campuses, and is a statistically significant difference.

Sex

Using adjusted percentages, the male student population is underrepresented in the respondents by five percent, a statistically significant difference.

Minority Status

The three groups that comprise our minority category, Asian, Black, and Hispanic students, were 15 percent of the respondents and 20 percent of the fall student body. It is primarily the Black students who are underrepresented, making up eight percent of the replies and eleven percent of the fall 1983 students.

Many students, both in the sample and in the total student population, could not be categorized by race or ethnicity. The "unknown" category is 19 percent of the sample and 17 percent of the fall 1983 student body. It is possible, of course, that some of the "unknowns" are minority students and that this group, in reality, is not underrepresented.

The minority respondents, like minorities in the total student body, are unevenly distributed among the campuses. Enrollment patterns of Black, Asian and Hispanic respondents by campus parallel that of these students in the fall 1983 student body. Sixty percent of the Black respondents were enrolled at Takoma Park, 33 percent at Rockville, and four percent at Germantown. Sixty percent of the Asian respondents were enrolled at Rockville, 30 percent at Takoma Park and three percent at Germantown. The enrollment of Hispanic respondents by campus differed slightly, but not significantly, from that of the Hispanic students enrolled in fall 1983. About two thirds of the Hispanic students were enrolled at Rockville and about one third were enrolled at Takoma Park in fall 1983. A slightly larger percentage of Hispanic survey respondents were enrolled at Rockville (68%) and a slightly smaller percentage were enrolled at the Takoma Park Campus (27%).

TABLE 1
Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students

		Respondents N = 7254			Fall 1983 Students N = 20314	
		N	%	Adj. %	N	%
Campus						
	Germantown	946	13	14	2397	12
	Rockville	4222	58	60	12369	61
	Takoma Park	1434	20	20	4291	21
	Off-Campus	451	6	6	1257	6
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Credits						
	Full-time	2005	28	28	6190	30
	Part-time	5048	70	72	14124	70
	Unknown	201	2	-		
	Total	7254	100	100%	20314	100%
Time						
	Day	3710	51	53	11061	54
	Evening	2383	33	34	6414	32
	Day/Eve	960	13	14	2839	14
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Residence						
	Montgomery Co.	6487	90	92	18424	91
	Maryland	251	3	4	819	4
	Nonresidents	315	4	4	1071	5
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Sex						
	Male	2758	38	39	9035	44
	Female	4295	59	61	11279	56
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%

TABLE 1 (Continued)
Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students

		Respondents N = 7254			Fall 1983 Students N = 20314		
		N	%	Adj. %	N	%	Adj. %
Age							
	15-19 years	1296	18	19	4366	22	
	20-29 years	2989	41	43	9808	48	
	30-39 years	1322	18	19	3270	16	
	40-49 years	633	9	9	1505	7	
	50 and over	666	9	10	1365	7	
	Unknown	348	5	-	-	-	
	Total	7254	100	100	20314	100	
Race and Ethnicity							
	Asian	443	6	7	1446	7	9
	Black	460	6	8	1865	9	11
	Hispanic	216	3	4	787	4	5
	White	4654	64	79	12153	60	72
	Other	138	2	2	510	3	3
	Unknown	1343	19	-	3553	17	-
		7254	100%	100%	20314	100%	100%
Transfers							
	1 - 15 credits	417	6		1033	5	
	16 or more credits	478	7		1036	5	
		895	13%		2069	10	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1 Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students. 5

Tables on: Most Convenient Time for Classes
Least Convenient Time for Classes
Preferred Schedule for a 3-Credit Course

Tables with the above titles are presented for each of the groups listed below.

1-3 Total College: Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students 11

4-6 Germantown: Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students. 13

7-9 Rockville: Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students 15

10-12 Takoma Park: Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students 17

13-15 Off-Campus Students: Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students . 19

16-18 Full-Time and Part-Time Students 21

19-21 Asian, Black and Hispanic Students 23

22-24 Students Transferring Credits to MC. 25

25-27 Montgomery County, Maryland, and Nonresidents. 27

28-30 Males and Females. 29

APPENDIX

Total College: Time and Place Requests for Courses. 36

Total College: Course Requests by Subject and Campus 37

Germantown: Summary of Course and Time Requests 38

Rockville: Summary of Course and Time Requests. 40

Takoma Park: Summary of Course and Time Requests. 42

Current Student Survey Report

Part 3: Student Preferences on Class Scheduling

In November 1983 all students enrolled as of the third week of classes in credit courses at Montgomery College, on or off-campus, were sent a questionnaire which included questions on class scheduling preferences. Students enrolled only for the mini semester are not included in the respondents.

This report analyzes the responses to five questions on class scheduling preferences:

1) At what time is it most convenient for you to attend class?
2) At what time(s) can't you attend class?
3) For a typical three credit course, would you prefer to meet: (5 choices varying semester length, number of weekly meetings, and duration of each class).
4) Have you ever taken a course through the television media?
5) Would you like to take a course via TV or cable?

The response rate for four of the five questions was quite high, ranging from 74 percent to 98 percent of the total College respondents. However, only 33 percent answered the second question: "At what time(s) can't you attend class?" Some student groups had even smaller percentages answering this question. Probably the responses to this question, called "least convenient time for classes" in this report, are of lesser value.

In the first section of the report the responses to all five questions are summarized for the total College and for each student subgroup: students grouped by campus, by full-time/part-time status, by race and ethnic status, by credits transferred to Montgomery College, by residence and by sex. Because scheduling preferences were closely related to time of class attendance, the data for each campus is tabulated for day, evening, and day/evening students enrolled at that campus.

The second part of the report is organized by question, and includes the range of percentages by subgroups for each response.

Total College Preferences on Class Scheduling

Most convenient time for classes: Mornings or evenings were the preferred class times for most respondents. Forty-nine percent chose mornings and 40 percent preferred evenings. Only nine percent preferred afternoon classes and only two percent preferred classes on weekends.

When the students are grouped by time of class attendance, it becomes apparent that their preferences match their behavior. Day students prefer morning classes and evening students prefer evening classes. The majority of day/evening students preferred morning classes, and 29 percent preferred evening classes (Table 1). [75% of the total College respondents answered this question.]

Least convenient time for classes: Forty-one percent rejected weekends; 25 percent rejected evenings; 20 percent rejected mornings; and 14 percent rejected afternoons. Thus afternoon classes, although not preferred, were rejected by the smallest percentage of respondents.

It is rather hard to interpret the responses of students grouped by time of class attendance. Day students are similar to total College respondents in their pattern of rejection. Only 18 percent of the evening students answered this question, and their responses are somewhat surprising in that 30 percent said they could not attend evening classes. Perhaps they have discovered that they don't like evening classes, or perhaps they were confused. Day/Evening students, who had a 47 percent response rate on this question, did not like weekend classes (Table 2). [33% of the total College respondents answered this question.]

Preferred schedule for a three credit course: A fifteen week semester was preferred by 92 percent of the respondents. There was no clear favorite among the choices of meeting once a week for three hours, twice a week for one and a half hours, or three times a week for one hour. Each of these options for a fifteen week semester course were favored by about 30 percent of the respondents. Of the eight percent who preferred an eight week semester, almost everyone preferred meeting twice a week for three hour classes to meeting once a week for a six hour class.

The preferences of students grouped by time of class attendance are similar in that they all prefer the 15 week semester and about one third prefer classes meeting twice a week for one and a half hours. Day students, however, prefer meeting three times a week for one hour and evening students prefer meeting once a week for three hours. The preferences of the day/evening students were more evenly divided. Most likely, day/evening students needed two choices: one for day-time classes and one for evening classes (Table 3). [88% of the total College respondents answered this question.]

A television course: Thirty-nine percent (39%) of the respondents said they would like to take a course by TV or cable. (N=6900, or 95% of the total College respondents.) Only five percent had already done so. (N=7140, or 98% of the total College respondents.)

Thirty-five percent (35%) of the day students, 41 percent of the evening students, and 46 percent of the day/evening students said they were interested in taking a course by TV.

TOTAL COLLEGE: DAY, EVENING AND DAY/EVENING

Table 1
Most Convenient Time for Classes

	Total		Day	Eve	Day/Eve
			N = 2767	1905	606
	N	%	%	%	%
Morning	2626	49	80	2	55
Afternoon	467	9	13	1	14
Evening	2128	40	4	95	29
Weekend	128	2	3	2	2
Total	5349	100	100	100	100

Table 2
Least Convenient Time for Classes

	Total		Day	Eve	Day/Eve
			N = 1513	428	447
	N	%	%	%	%
Morning	481	20	16	35	19
Afternoon	349	14	15	13	15
Evening	616	25	29	30	10
Weekend	972	41	40	22	56
Total	2418	100	100	100	100

Table 3
Preferred Schedule for a 3-Credit Course

		Total		Day	Eve	Day/Eve
				N = 3324	2128	827
		N	%	%	%	%
15 Weeks	Once a week, 3 hrs.	1751	28	11	55	22
	Twice a week, 1-1/2 hrs.	2189	34	35	32	37
	Three a week, 1 hr.	1911	30	47	3	32
8 Weeks	Twice a week, 3 hrs.	465	7	6	9	8
	Once a week, 6 hrs.	38	1	1	1	1
	Total	6354	100	100	100	100

Germantown Preferences on Class Scheduling

Most convenient time for classes: A majority of the Germantown respondents preferred evening classes and about one third preferred classes in the morning. Only six percent preferred afternoons and three percent preferred weekend classes. Students grouped by time of class attendance revealed significant differences. Day students preferred morning classes, evening students preferred evening classes, and day/evening students preferred morning and evening classes (Table 4). [78% of the Germantown respondents answered this question.]

Least convenient time for classes: Forty-seven percent rejected weekends; 23 percent rejected evenings; 15 percent rejected mornings and 15 percent rejected afternoons. The majority of day students and day/evening students rejected weekend classes. Evening, strangely enough, was the most rejected time by the 72 evening students that answered the question (Table 5). [29% of the Germantown respondents answered this question.]

Preferred schedule for a three credit course: Ninety-two percent preferred a fifteen week semester. Classes meeting once a week for three hours were favored by 38 percent; classes meeting twice a week for one and a half hours were favored by 30 percent, and those meeting three times a week for one hour were favored by 24 percent. Only eight percent preferred the eight week semester, and almost all preferred meeting twice a week for three hours to one six hour class a week.

Eighty-three percent of the day students preferred classes meeting two or three times a week for 15 weeks. Two thirds of the evening students favored meeting once a week, and one quarter favored meeting twice a week. Day/evening students had no clear favorite for a three credit course over the 15 week semester. Most of the 65 Germantown respondents preferring an eight week semester were evenings students (Table 6). [90% of the Germantown respondents answered this question.]

A television course: Forty-two percent indicated interest in taking a course by TV or cable. (N=904, or 96% of the Germantown respondents.) Four percent had already taken a course by TV. (N=946, or 100% of the Germantown respondents.)

GERMANTOWN CAMPUS: DAY, EVENING AND DAY/EVENING

Table 4
Most Convenient Time for Classes
Germantown Campus

	Total		Day	Eve	Day/ Eve
			N = 289	369	76
	N	%	%	%	%
Morning	270	37	77	2	53
Afternoon	42	6	12	0	11
Evening	401	54	7	96	35
Weekend	21	3	4	2	1
Total	734	100	100	100	100

Table 5
Least Convenient Time for Classes

	Total		Day	Eve	Day/ Eve
			N = 155	72	47
	N	%	%	%	%
Morning	40	15	9	30	13
Afternoon	42	15	17	12	15
Evening	63	23	22	35	7
Weekend	129	47	52	23	65
Total	274	100	100	100	100

Table 6
Preferred Schedule for a 3-Credit Course

		Total		Day	Eve	Day/ Eve
				N = 354	392	101
		N	%	%	%	%
15 Weeks	Once a week, 3 hrs.	323	38	12	64	26
	Twice a week, 1-1/2 hrs.	252	30	34	25	31
	Three a week, 1 hr.	207	24	49	1	34
8 Weeks	Twice a week, 3 hrs.	56	7	5	8	9
	Once a week, 6 hrs.	9	1	*	2	0
	Total	847	100	100	100	100

*Less than one percent.

Rockville Preferences on Class Scheduling

Most convenient time for classes: A majority of the Rockville respondents preferred morning classes and one third preferred evening classes. Ten percent preferred afternoon and two percent preferred weekends. Day students preferred morning classes; evening students preferred evening classes; and day/evening students preferred morning and evening classes (Table 7). [75% of the Rockville respondents answered this question.]

Least convenient time for classes: Weekends were rejected by 41 percent; evening by 24 percent; morning by 20 percent; and afternoon by 15 percent. Significantly fewer evening students rejected weekend classes. Their least convenient time was morning. Significantly more day/evening students rejected weekend classes. The rejection pattern of day students parallel that of total Rockville respondents (Table 8). [35% of the Rockville respondents answered this question.]

Preferred schedule for a three credit course: Fifteen week semesters were preferred by 93 percent of the Rockville respondents. Two one and one-half hour classes a week were favored by 36 percent; three one hour classes a week were favored by 35 percent; and one three hour class a week was preferred by 22 percent. Almost all of the respondents who favored the eight week semester preferred attending two three hour classes a week. Half of the day students preferred meeting three times a week for 15 weeks. Almost half of the evening students preferred meeting once a week for 15 weeks. Three quarters of the day/evening students preferred meeting two or three times a week (Table 9). [89% of the Rockville respondents answered this question.]

A course via TV: Thirty-seven percent thought they would like to take a course by TV or cable. (N=4091, or 97% of Rockville respondents.) Four percent had already done so. (N=4222, or 100% of the Rockville respondents.)

ROCKVILLE CAMPUS: DAY, EVENING AND DAY/EVENING

Table 7
Most Convenient Time for Classes
Rockville Campus

	Total		Day N = 1787	Eve 996	Day/ Eve 369
	N	%	%	%	%
Morning	1696	54	81	2	59
Afternoon	317	10	14	1	16
Evening	1078	34	3	96	23
Weekend	61	2	2	1	2
Total	3152	100	100	100	100

Table 8
Least Convenient Time for Classes

	Total		Day N = 937	Eve 219	Day/ Eve 304
	N	%	%	%	%
Morning	296	20	16	35	21
Afternoon	220	15	15	17	14
Evening	356	24	29	29	8
Weekend	588	41	40	19	57
Total	1460	100	100	100	100

Table 9
Preferred Schedule for a 3-Credit Course

		Total		Day N = 2117	Eve 1117	Day/ Eve 521
		N	%	%	%	%
15 Weeks	Once a week, 3 hrs.	799	22	9	47	17
	Twice a week, 1-1/2 hrs.	1348	36	33	39	40
	Three a week, 1 hr.	1311	35	52	4	36
8 Weeks	Twice a week, 3 hrs.	281	7	6	10	7
	Once a week, 6 hrs.	16	*	*	*	*
	Total	3755	100	100	100	100

*Less than one percent.

Takoma Park Preferences on Class Scheduling

Most convenient time for classes: Morning classes were preferred by 56 percent of the Takoma Park respondents and evening classes were preferred by 34 percent. Seven percent preferred afternoon classes and three percent preferred weekend classes. Most of the day students preferred morning classes; most of the evening students preferred evening classes; and most of the day/evening students preferred morning or evening classes (Table 10). [74% of the Takoma Park respondents answered this question.]

Least convenient time for classes: Thirty-six percent rejected weekends; 30 percent rejected evenings; 21 percent rejected mornings; and 13 percent rejected afternoons. Seventy percent of the Takoma Park students responding to this question were day students, thus their responses are probably more useful than those of the few evening and day/evening students. Weekend classes were rejected by a smaller percentage (36%) of Takoma Park respondents, compared to those on the other campuses. Afternoon was the least rejected time by the respondents enrolled at Takoma Park (Table 11). [38% of the Takoma Park respondents answered this question.]

Preferred schedule for a three credit course: A fifteen week semester was the choice of 92 percent of the Takoma Park respondents. Classes meeting twice a week for one and a half hours were favored by 37 percent; those meeting three times a week for one hour were favored by 28 percent; and those meeting once a week for three hours by 27 percent. Of those that liked the eight week semester, meeting twice a week for three hour classes was much preferred to the once a week schedule. Most of the day students preferred meeting two or three times a week. Over half of the evening students favored meeting once a week and one third favored meeting twice a week. Day/evening student preferences were about evenly divided among the three choices (Table 12). [88% of the Takoma Park respondents answered this question.]

A television course: Thirty-nine percent of the Takoma Park respondents expressed interest in taking a course by TV or cable. (N=1388, or 97% Takoma Park respondents.) Nine percent had done so. (N=1434, or 100% of the Takoma Park respondents.)

TAKOMA PARK CAMPUS: DAY, EVENING AND DAY/EVENING

Table 10
Most Convenient Time for Classes
Takoma Park Campus

	Total		Day N = 627	Eve 290	Day/ Eve 145
	N	%	%	%	%
Morning	595	56	83	3	49
Afternoon	75	7	9	1	8
Evening	364	34	5	93	43
Weekend	28	3	3	3	*
Total	1062	100	100	100	100

Table 11
Least Convenient Time for Classes

	Total		Day N = 384	Eve 69	Day/ Eve 97
	N	%	%	%	%
Morning	113	21	16	42	20
Afternoon	71	13	13	8	17
Evening	163	30	33	27	19
Weekend	203	36	38	23	44
Total	550	100	100	100	100

Table 12
Preferred Schedule for a 3-Credit Course

		Total		Day N = 760	Eve 317	Day/ Eve 191
		N	%	%	%	%
15 Weeks	Once a week, 3 hrs.	339	27	14	55	28
	Twice a week, 1-1/2 hrs.	466	37	40	33	36
	Three a week, 1 hr.	358	28	40	3	25
8 Weeks	Twice a week, 3 hrs.	95	7	6	8	10
	Once a week, 6 hrs.	10	1	*	1	1
	Total	1268	100	100	100	100

*Less than one percent.

Off-Campus Students Preferences on Class Scheduling

Most convenient time for classes: Evening classes were preferred by 81 percent of the off-campus respondents. Mornings, afternoons, or weekends were preferred by between five percent and seven percent of the off-campus respondents. Eighty percent of the off-campus students answering this question were evening students, and they strongly favored evening classes. The off-campus day students had a larger percentage (30%) than any other group preferring afternoon classes, but this was only 18 individuals (Table 13). [73% of the Off-Campus respondents answered this question.]

Least convenient time for classes: Thirty-seven percent rejected weekends; 25 percent rejected mornings; 25 percent rejected evenings; and 13 percent rejected afternoons. The rejection pattern of the 104 off-campus students responding to this question is similar to that of the total College respondents (Table 14). [23% of the Off-Campus respondents answered this question.]

Preferred schedule for a three credit course: Ninety-one percent favored the 15 week semester. Classes meeting once a week for three hours was the choice of 65 percent of the off-campus respondents. Twenty-four percent preferred meeting twice a week and only 2 percent preferred meeting three times a week. Of the nine percent who favored an eight week semester, almost all preferred meeting twice a week for three hour classes. Seventy-six percent of those responding to this question were evening students, who heavily favored classes meeting once a week for 15 weeks. The 83 off-campus day students mostly preferred meeting twice a week (Table 15). [91% of the Off-Campus respondents answered this question.]

A television course: Forty-five percent indicated interest in taking a course by TV. (N=431, or 96 percent of the off-campus respondents.) Five percent had already done so. (N=451, or 100% of the off-campus respondents.)

OFF-CAMPUS: DAY, EVENING AND DAY/EVENING

Table 13
Most Convenient Time for Classes

	Total		Day N = 58	Eve 263	Day/ Eve 9
	N	%	%	%	%
Morning	24	7	25	3	11
Afternoon	22	7	30	1	22
Evening	269	81	27	95	56
Weekend	15	5	18	1	11
Total	330	100	100	100	100

Table 14
Least Convenient Time for Classes

	Total		Day N = 27	Eve 73	Day/ Eve 4
	N	%	%	%	%
Morning	26	25	19	29	0
Afternoon	13	13	27	9	0
Evening	26	25	12	32	0
Weekend	39	37	42	30	100
Total	104	100	100	100	100

Table 15
Preferred Schedule for a 3-Credit Course

		Total		Day N = 83	Eve 311	Day/ Eve 15
		N	%	%	%	%
15 Weeks	Once a week, 3 hrs.	270	65	31	75	60
	Twice a week, 1-1/2 hrs.	97	24	60	15	13
	Three a week, 1 hr.	8	2	4	1	7
8 Weeks	Twice a week, 3 hrs.	31	8	5	8	20
	Once a week, 6 hrs.	3	1	0	1	0
	Total	409	100	100	100	100

Full-Time and Part-Time Students

Full-time students showed quite clear preferences for morning classes (85%), and unlike most student groups, even preferred afternoon classes (12%) over evenings (3%). Almost all full-time students preferred the 15 week semester, with a strong preference for classes meeting three times a week for one hour (63%). A majority rejected weekend classes.

The majority of part-time students preferred evening classes and about one third preferred morning classes. There was no strong pattern regarding the least convenient time for classes; between 18 percent and 33 percent rejected each time. Part-time students differed considerably from full-time students in their preferred three credit course schedule. Part-time students clearly preferred meeting once or twice a week rather than three times a week during the 15 week semester. The eight week semester was chosen by only nine percent of the part-time students (Tables 16, 17, and 18).

Three percent of the full-time students and six percent of the part-time students had taken a course through television. Thirty-six percent of the full-time students and 40 percent of the part-time students expressed interest in taking such a course.

Percent Responding to Questions

	Full-Time %	Part-Time %
Table 16	74	75
Table 17	46	29
Table 18	91	88

FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME STUDENTS

Table 16
Most Convenient Time for Classes

	Number		Percent	
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-time
Morning	1274	1311	85%	35%
Afternoon	175	281	12%	7%
Evening	43	2069	3%	55%
Weekend	1	124	*	3%
Total	1493	3785	100%	100%

Table 17
Least Convenient Time for Classes

	Number		Percent	
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time
Morning	128	347	14%	24%
Afternoon	86	260	9%	18%
Evening	234	374	25%	25%
Weekend	474	485	52%	33%
Total	922	1466	100%	100%

Table 18
Preferred Schedule for a 3-Credit Course

		Number		Percent	
		Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time
15 Weeks	Once a week, 3 hrs.	116	1615	6%	36%
	Twice a week, 1-1/2 hrs.	473	1690	26%	38%
	Three a week, 1 hr.	1150	734	63%	17%
8 Weeks	Twice a week, 3 hrs.	89	374	5%	8%
	Once a week, 6 hrs.	6	32	*%	1%
	Total	1834	4445	100%	100%

*Less than one percent.

Minorities: Asian, Black and Hispanic Students

Minority students preferred morning classes. This was especially true of Hispanic students, 71 percent of whom chose mornings as the most convenient time for classes. The second most popular time for classes was the evening. Forty-six percent of the minority respondents answered the question on the least convenient time for classes; and they, unlike the nonminority respondents, had the largest percent disliking evening classes, rather than weekend classes. About one third of the Asian and Black students said they were unable to attend evening classes.

The schedules for a three credit course preferred by minority students were those meeting three times a week or twice a week for a fifteen week semester. Only 22 percent preferred the once a week schedule (Tables 19, 20 and 21).

Taking a course by TV appealed to 47 percent of the Black students and to 44 percent of the Hispanic respondents. The Asian students, however, were the least responsive of any student group to the idea of taking such a course, with only 33 percent responding positively.

	Percent Responding to Questions		
	Asian %	Black %	Hispanic %
Table 19	78	73	76
Table 20	55	37	42
Table 21	91	88	86

ASIAN, BLACK AND HISPANIC STUDENTS

Table 19
Most Convenient Time for Classes

	Number			Percent			Total	
	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	N	%
Morning	214	182	118	61%	54%	71%	514	61%
Afternoon	41	15	7	12%	5%	4%	63	7%
Evening	78	125	39	23%	37%	24%	242	29%
Weekend	13	13	1	4%	4%	1%	27	3%
Total	346	335	165	100%	100%	100%	846	100%

Table 20
Least Convenient Time for Classes

	Number			Percent			Total	
	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	N	%
Morning	62	48	33	25%	28%	37%	143	28%
Afternoon	27	17	13	11%	10%	14%	57	11%
Evening	87	59	21	36%	34%	23%	167	34%
Weekend	68	47	23	28%	28%	26%	138	27%
Total	244	171	90	100%	100%	100%	505	100%

Table 21
Preferred Schedule for a 3-Credit Course

		Number			Percent			Total	
		Asian	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Hispanic	N	%
15 Weeks	Once a week-3 hours	77	104	32	19%	26%	17%	213	22%
	Twice a week-1-1/2 hours	141	114	59	35%	28%	32%	314	32%
	Three a week-1 hour	157	149	82	39%	36%	44%	388	38%
8 Weeks	Twice a week-3 hours	23	35	11	6%	9%	6%	69	7%
	Once a Week-6 hours	3	4	1	1%	1%	1%	8	1%
		401	406	185	100%	100%	100%	992	100%

Transfer Students

Transfer students preferred morning or evening classes. A majority of the transfer students with 16 or more credits preferred classes in the evening. Transfer students parallel the total College respondents in their choices of the least convenient time for classes. The schedules for a three credit course preferred by transfer students were the twice a week schedule or the once a week schedule for 15 weeks. Not many transfer students liked meeting three times a week (Tables 22, 23 and 24).

Ten percent of the transfer students with between 1-15 credits had already taken a TV course, the highest percentage of any student group having done so. They parallel other students in the percent expressing interest in taking such a course.

Percent Responding to Questions

	1-15 Credits	16 Credits and Above
	%	%
Table 22	72	74
Table 23	39	32
Table 24	88	90

STUDENTS TRANSFERRING CREDITS TO MONTGOMERY COLLEGE
1-15 CREDITS AND 16 OR MORE CREDITS

Table 22
Most Convenient Time for Classes

	Number			Percent		
	1-15	16 and above	Total	1-15	16 and above	Total
Morning	136	141	277	45%	40%	42%
Afternoon	32	19	51	11%	5%	8%
Evening	128	186	314	42%	52%	48%
Weekend	6	9	15	2%	3%	2%
Total	302	355	657	100%	100%	100%

Table 23
Least Convenient Time for Classes

	Number			Percent		
	1-15	16 and above	Total	1-15	16 and above	Total
Morning	28	34	62	17%	23%	20%
Afternoon	20	24	44	12%	16%	14%
Evening	31	34	65	19%	23%	21%
Weekend	83	59	142	52%	38%	45%
Total	162	151	313	100%	100%	100%

Table 24
Preferred Schedule for a 3-Credit Course

		Number			Percent		
		1-15	16 and above	Total	1-15	16 and above	Total
15 Weeks	Once a week-3 hours	111	133	244	30%	31%	31%
	Twice a week-1-1/2 hours	126	178	304	35%	40%	37%
	Three a week-1 hour	97	77	174	26%	18%	22%
8 Weeks	Twice a week-3 hours	31	41	72	8%	10%	9%
	Once a Week-6 hours	3	2	5	1%	1%	1%
		368	431	799	100%	100%	100%

Montgomery County, Maryland, and Nonresidents

Montgomery County and noncounty Maryland residents did not differ on preferred time for classes: morning or evenings were preferred by over 40 percent of each. The nonresident students also preferred these times for classes, but mornings were favored by 63 percent and evenings by only 24 percent.

County and Maryland residents and nonresidents parallel total College respondents in their choices on the least convenient time for classes, except that the nonresidents and Maryland residents were a little less opposed to weekend or afternoon classes.

The preferred three credit course for most nonresident respondents meets three times a week or twice a week rather than once a week. County and Maryland residents had about equal percentages favoring each of the three choices. Ninety-two percent of each preferred the 15 week semester (Tables 25, 26 and 27).

Forty-five percent of the Maryland residents indicated interest in taking a TV course, while only 34 percent of the nonresidents expressed this interest.

Percent Responding to Questions

	MC	MD	NR
	%	%	%
Table 25	75	75	80
Table 26	33	31	44
Table 27	89	90	90

MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND, AND NONRESIDENTS

Table 25
Most Convenient Time for Classes

	Number			Percent		
	MC	MD	NR	MC	MD	NR
Morning	2340	84	161	49%	45%	63%
Afternoon	410	17	29	8%	9%	12%
Evening	1969	82	61	41%	43%	24%
Weekend	117	6	2	2%	3%	1%
Total	4836	189	253	100%	100%	100%

Table 26
Least Convenient Time for Classes

	Number			Percent		
	MC	MD	NR	MC	MD	NR
Morning	422	19	34	19%	24%	24%
Afternoon	326	8	12	15%	10%	9%
Evening	542	23	43	25%	29%	31%
Weekend	879	29	51	41%	37%	36%
Total	2169	79	140	100%	100%	100%

Table 27
Preferred Schedule for a 3-Credit Course

		Number			Percent		
		MC	MD	NR	MC	MD	NR
15 Weeks	Once a week, 3 hrs.	1614	64	53	28%	28%	19%
	Twice a week, 1-1/2 hrs.	1997	68	98	35%	30%	34%
	Three a week, 1 hr.	1695	76	113	29%	34%	39%
8 Weeks	Twice a week, 3 hrs.	427	17	19	7%	8%	7%
	Once a week, 6 hrs.	35	1	2	1%	*	1%
	Total	5768	226	285	100%	100%	100%

*Less than one percent.

Males and Females

Male and female preferences on class scheduling were similar, paralleling those of the total College. The only difference found was on the issue of the number of classes per week preferred for a three credit course. Women students liked meeting once a week for three hours more than the men did. More men than women preferred classes meeting three times a week (Tables 28, 29 and 30).

Percent Responding to Questions

	Males %	Females %
Table 28	76	74
Table 29	37	32
Table 30	91	88

MALES AND FEMALES

Table 28
Most Convenient Time for Classes

	Number		Percent	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Morning	1026	1559	48%	49%
Afternoon	201	255	10%	8%
Evening	839	1273	40%	40%
Weekend	40	85	2%	3%
Total	2106	3172	100%	100%

Table 29
Least Convenient Time for Classes

	Number		Percent	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Morning	221	254	22%	18%
Afternoon	128	218	13%	16%
Evening	264	344	26%	25%
Weekend	394	565	39%	41%
Total	1007	1381	100%	100%

Table 30
Preferred Schedule for a 3-Credit Course

		Number		Percent	
		Male	Female	Male	Female
15 Weeks	Once a week, 3 hrs.	616	1115	25%	30%
	Twice a week, 1-1/2 hrs.	830	1333	33%	34%
	Three a week, 1 hr.	868	1016	34%	27%
8 Weeks	Twice a week, 3 hrs.	181	282	7%	8%
	Once a week, 6 hrs.	17	21	1%	1%
	Total	2512	3767	100%	100%

*Less than one percent.

COMPARISON OF STUDENT SUBGROUPS BY QUESTION

The Most Convenient Time for Classes

Seventy-four percent of the total College respondents answered this question. There were four possible choices: morning, afternoon, evening and weekend. For each choice we will present the percent of total College responses, the range in percentages of student groups making the choice, and groups that differ significantly from the norm.

Morning: Preferred by 49 percent of the total College respondents. The percentages ranged from a high of 85 percent of the full-time students to two percent of the evening students. Groups in which the majority of students preferred morning classes were: all minority students, nonresidents, day/evening students, and full-time students. Only about one third of the part-time students preferred morning classes, which was significantly lower than the College norm.

Afternoon: Preferred by nine percent of the total College respondents. The percentages ranged from a high of 14 percent of the day/evening students to a low of one percent of the evening students. The difference among students grouped by time of class attendance was the only significant difference found on preference for afternoon classes.

Evening: Preferred by 40 percent of the total College respondents. The percentages ranged from a high of 95 percent of the evening students to lows of three percent of the full-time students and four percent of the day students. A majority of part-time students and of those transferring 16 or more credits preferred evening classes. Only about one fourth of the Asian, Hispanic and nonresident students preferred classes in the evening, which is significantly below the College norm.

Weekend: Preferred by two percent of the total College respondents. The percentages ranged from five percent of the off-campus students to less than one percent of the full-time students.

The Least Convenient Time for Classes

Only 33 percent of the total College respondents answered the question: "At what time(s) can't you attend class?" Even fewer evening students and off-campus students answered this question. The four choices were: morning, afternoon, evening, and weekend. Since more than twice as many answered the question on the most convenient time for classes, apparent inconsistencies in the responses can probably be explained by the small numbers answering the question on the least convenient time for classes.

Morning: Rejected by twenty percent of the total College respondents; i.e. chosen as the time they could not attend classes. The percentages ranged from a high of 37 percent of the Hispanics (33 individuals) to a low of 14 percent of the full-time students (128 individuals). Thirty-five percent of the evening students rejected morning classes. About one quarter of the part-time students, minority students, and noncounty residents indicated that they couldn't attend morning classes.

Afternoon: Rejected by 14 percent of the total College respondents. The percentages ranged from a high of 18 percent of the part-time students to a low of nine percent of the full-time students and nine percent of the nonresidents. There were no other significant differences among groups in the percent saying they could not attend afternoon classes.

Evening: Rejected by 25 percent of the total College respondents. The percentages ranged from 36 percent of the Asian students to a low of 10 percent of the day/evening students. Thirty-four percent (34%) of the Black students and 31 percent of the nonresidents indicated that they were unable to attend evening classes.

Weekend: Rejected by 41 percent of the total College respondents. The percentages ranged from 56 percent of the day/evening students to a low of 22 percent of the evening students. Groups with fewer students rejecting weekend classes were: minority students (27%), part-time students (33%), the nonresidents (36%) and evening students (22%).

Preferred Schedule for a Three Credit Course

Eighty-eight percent (88%) of the total College respondents answered this question in which the five possible choices varied semester length, number of classes per week, and the duration of each class session. The responses were:

One three hour class per week for 15 weeks: Preferred by 28 percent of the total College respondents. The percentages ranged from a high of 65 percent of the off-campus students to a low of six percent of the full-time students. This schedule was favored by 55 percent of the evening students and 36 percent of the part-time students. Significantly more females than males preferred meeting once a week (30% vs. 25%). Only 11 percent of the day students preferred this schedule. Twenty-two percent (22%) of both day/evening students and minority students favored classes meeting once a week.

Two one and one-half hour classes per week for 15 weeks: Preferred by 34 percent of the total College respondents. The percentages ranged from 40 percent of the transfers with 16 or more credits to a low of 24 percent of the off-campus students. Thirty-eight percent (38%) of the part-time students and 37 percent of the day/evening students prefered this schedule. Only 26 percent of the full-time students and 28 percent of the Black students favored meeting twice a week for one and one- half hour classes.

Three one hour classes per week for 15 weeks: Preferred by 30 percent of the total College respondents. The percentages ranged from a high of 63 percent of the full-time students to a low of two percent of the off-campus and three percent of the evening students. This was the choice of 47 percent of the day students and 44 percent of the Hispanic students. There were several significant differences between student groups on this choice. More minority than nonminority students preferred this (38% vs. 27%); more males than females preferred it (34% vs. 27%); and more nonresidents than County residents (39% vs. 29%) preferred classes meeting three times a week.

Two three hour classes per week for eight weeks: Preferred by seven percent of the total College respondents. The percentages ranged from a high of 10 percent of the transfer students with 16 or more credits to a low of five percent of the full-time students. There were no significant differences among student groups in the percent preferring this class schedule.

One six hour class per week for eight weeks: One percent of the total College respondents preferred this schedule. There were no differences among student groups. No more than one percent ever favored this schedule for a typical three credit course.

A Television Course

Only five percent of the total College respondents had taken a college course through the television media. The percentages ranged from a high of 10 percent of the transfer students with 1-15 credits to a low of three percent of the full-time students. There were no significant differences among student groups.

Thirty-nine percent (39%) of the total College respondents expressed a desire to take a course via TV and 61 percent indicated no desire to do so. The percentages of students responding positively ranged from a high of 47 percent of the Black students to a low of 33 percent of the Asian students. Groups more receptive to taking a TV course were: day/evening (46%), Maryland residents (45%), Hispanic students (44%) and Black students (47%). Asian and nonresident students (34%) had the smallest percentages receptive to taking a TV course.

Conclusion

To accommodate the time preferences revealed in this study, it would seem desirable to expand the number of evening courses offered at the Germantown campus and to increase the number of morning courses offered at the Rockville and Takoma Park campuses. This would undoubtedly be difficult to do given the limitations of space. However, full use of the space available at those times should be sought continuously.

The responses to the question on the preferred schedule for a typical three credit course primarily reinforce current practices, i.e. most day-time classes meet two or three times a week for 15 weeks, and most evening classes meet once or twice a week for 15 weeks. However, there were some variations by campus on the relative popularity of each of these schedules. The three times a week schedule was somewhat more popular than the twice a week schedule among Rockville and Germantown day students. At Takoma Park, the twice a week and three times a week schedules were favored by equal percentages of day students.

The one three hour class a week schedule was preferred by more evening students. This was especially true of the evening students at Germantown and at off-campus locations. Perhaps more night classes could be scheduled to meet once a week than is current practice.

For the efficient use of College facilties, the College might try to change student preferences. One alternative is making it possible for the student to take a full load of courses in the afternoon and early evening, and marketing the advantages of such a schedule. A few students requested more late afternoon or early evening classes.

It is possible that the key to expanding the number of afternoon, weekend, and mini-semester students is in discovering the specific courses desired by students at those times. The Appendix contains a summary of course requests by time from the respondents who answered an open-ended question on programs and services desired. There were more than 800 course requests, covering almost every subject taught at Montgomery College. Although evening was the most requested time for courses, most of these course requests did not specify a time of day.

The eight week semester was preferred by only eight percent of our respondents, who did not include students enrolled only for the mini-semester. No significant differences among campuses were found, but on all campuses, evening students indicated slightly more interest in the eight week semester than day students. At Takoma Park and off-campus, the day/evening students also indicated a higher level of interest in the mini-semester. If our respondents are representative of the level of interest for the mini-semester in the total College, then one could estimate about 1,625 students preferring an eight week semester. Probably the majority of eight week classes should be held in the evening, to meet twice a week for three hour sessions.

The data on the least convenient time for classes implies greater acceptance of weekend classes by Takoma Park Campus students, and greater acceptance by evening students in general. A very small percentage (18%) of the evening students, however, answered this question.

About 40 percent of the respondents indicated interest in taking a course by TV. Groups with even larger percentages receptive to taking a TV course were day/evening students, Maryland residents, Black students and Hispanic students. Thus, it appears that increasing the number of courses offered by TV would be a good idea.

Appendix A

This information is a summary of course and time requests given by respondents in answer to the question, "What program or service not already offered at the College would you like to have available?"

Most respondents requested courses in a specific topic but did not specify a time. Some requested more courses in general at a specific time or place. Some requested a specific course at a specific time and place.

Total College

Time and Place Requests for Courses*

	Germantown Respondents N	Rockville Respondents N	Takoma Park Respondents N	Total College N
Evening courses	18	70	36	124
Late afternoon courses	4	4	1	9
Early morning courses		1	1	2
"Day-time" courses	5	5	3	13
Weekend courses	3	17	14	34
Mini-semester courses		4	1	5
Summer courses	3	9	6	18
TV courses	2	11	21	34
More at campus of respondent	10	2	6	18
More at different campus		11	5	16
Off-campus courses		5	1	6
Totals	45	139	95	279

*All time and place requests for specific courses and for more courses in general.

145

Appendix A

Total College

College Course Requests by Subject and Campus

	Germantown	Rockville	Takoma Park	Total
	N	N	N	N
Accounting	8	11	3	22
Business & Management	11	25	17	53
Computer Science	29	40	22	91
Physical Education	13	38	22	73
Art	12	52	23	90
Music	4	7	9	20
Speech & Drama	1	4		5
Visual Com. Tech.	3	19	5	27
English	11	12	21	44
Foreign Language	5	29	12	46
Philosophy	1		6	7
Social Sciences*	8	38	26	72
Sign Language		7	4	11
Natural Sciences**	15	33	33	81
Mathematics	10	14	1	24
Engineering & Tech.***	12	53	20	85
Personal Development		7		7
Nursing and Allied Health	10	23	41	74
Miscellaneous	10	29	34	73

* History, Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology, Law, Education
** Physics, Geoscience, Astronomy, Chemistry, Biology
***Engineering Science and Applied Technologies

Lists of the specific courses requested are available from the Office of Institutional Research.

Appendix A

Germantown Campus

Scheduling Suggestions from Germantown Respondents

One hundred forty-eight (148) Germantown respondents gave scheduling requests and suggestions in response to the question, "What program or service not already offered at the College would you like to have available?"

Summary of Course and Time Requests

	Total Requests	Time Requests			
Subject	N	Day N	Evening N	Weekend N	Summer N
Computer Science	29		3		
Science & Engineering	27	3	7		1
Mathematics	10		3		
Business & Management	19		1		
Art, Music, Photography	20	2			
Physical Education	13		1	1	
English & Foreign Language	17		2		
Social Science	8		1		
Medical, Allied Health	10				
Vocational, Special Interest	10				
Total	163	5	18	1	1

Lists of the specific courses requested are available from the Office of Institutional Research.

N	Germantown General Scheduling Suggestions
4	More late afternoon or early evening courses, making it possible to attend two classes in one evening
3	Summer classes at Germantown; one specifying in the evening; one requested both short and long summer sessions
3	A survey of student course needs and the scheduling of additional courses to accommodate these needs
1	The semester end (including exam week), one week before Christmas
1	More weekend classes
2	More technical or certificate programs, (other than medical and dental) at the Germantown Campus
14	More courses in general (1 spring semester)
2	More advanced courses in general
2	TV classes at Germantown
1	More credit by exam
1	"Work cooperative" courses
1	"Research programs"
3	University of Maryland courses offered at Germantown Campus in the evening
24	MC should become a four-year college (3 Engineering Degree, (1 Science Degree)

Appendix A

Rockville Campus

Scheduling Requests from Rockville Respondents

Three hundred twenty (320) Rockville respondents gave scheduling requests and suggestions in response to the question "What program or service not already offered at the College would you like to have available?"

Summary of Course and Time Requests

	Total Requests	Time Requests			
		Day	Evening	Weekend	Summer
Subject	N	N	N	N	N
Art	52	1	6		
Music	7			1	1
Speech & Drama	4				
Visual Communications Tech.	19		1		
Accounting, Business, Management	36		8		
Computer Science	40		2	1	
Physical Education	38	1	4		
English, Foreign Language	41		5	2	1
Social Sciences	38	1	3		1
Education	7		1	1	
Natural Sciences	33	1	5	1	2
Mathematics	14	1	7		1
Engineering & Technologies	53	1	8		1
Personal Development	7				
Medical, Allied Health	23		1		
Miscellaneous	29				
Total	441	6	51	6	7

Lists of the specific courses requested are available from the Office of Institutional Research.

N	Rockville General Scheduling Suggestions
21	More evening courses (subject unspecified)
2	Schedule evening courses from 7-10 p.m.
4	Schedule late afternoon classes
1	Schedule early morning classes
9	Schedule course sections at different times
3	More courses meeting once a week for three hours
1	More courses meeting three times a week for one hour
8	More weekend courses
2	More sophomore level weekend courses
7	Help students nearing degree completion: assess needs, schedule needed courses in the evening, weekends, or in summer session and don't cancel if enrollment is below 15
4	More mini-session courses, at greater variety of times
1	January mini-session (between semesters), offer HE100, PS101, EN101, and MA110.
3	Two summer sessions
2	More summer courses
1	Offer more courses second summer session
5	More off-campus credit courses
11	More TV courses (1 Math, 1 Chemistry, 1 Biology, 3 exams at Rockville)
2	More credit by exam
2	Credit for on-the-job training
1	More Honors courses
31	MC should become a four-year College (2 Find Arts Degree, 1 Music)

Appendix A

Takoma Park Campus

Scheduling Suggestions from Takoma Park Respondents

Two hundred forty-nine (249) Takoma Park students gave scheduling requests and suggestions in response to the question, "What program or service not already offered at the College would you like to have available?"

Summary of Course and Time Requests

	Total Requests	Time Requests			
		Day	Evening	Weekend	Summer
Subject	N	N	N	N	N
College of the Air	21		1		1
Medical & Nursing	41		8	1	2
Science & Math	34		5	3	
Engineering & Engineering Tech.	20		2	2	
Computer Science	22			1	
Business & Management	20	2	3		
Art, Music, Photography	34		2	1	
English, Philosphy, Commun.	27		5	2	
Foreign Language	12	1	2		
Sign Language	4		1		
Social Science	26		1		
Physical Education	22			1	1
Miscellaneous	34				
Total	317	3	30	11	4

Lists of the specific courses requested are available from the Office of Institutional Research.

N	Takoma Park General Scheduling Suggestions
7	A greater variety of courses
5	A greater variety of evening courses
3	More weekend classes
1	Sunday classes
2	More summer classes
1	A mini-semester at Takoma Park
1	More classes meeting once a week
1	More sections and times of courses
1	Courses starting after 8 p.m.
1	Courses starting at 6:30 or 7 a.m. and at 4:30 or 5 p.m.
1	More variety in Community Personal Development courses
1	More courses in neighborhood schools
11	MC should become a four-year college (3 Nursing, 2 Science)

Scheduling Suggestions from Off-campus Respondents

Only three off-campus students made scheduling suggestions.

N	Scheduling Requests
1	More College of the Air courses
1	More courses that meet once a week
1	More elementary and intermediate courses at DMA and that CS110 and CS111 be offered consecutive semesters in the evening at DMA

Appendix B

MONTGOMERY COLLEGE
Current Student Survey
1983–1984

Place address label here.

(Please make corrections if necessary.)

____
(Name)

____
(Address)

____

Dear Montgomery College Student:

I sincerely hope that you are finding your experience at Montgomery College pleasant and rewarding.

As a student enrolled at Montgomery College in the 1983–1984 academic year, you are a necessary part of the Current Student Survey being conducted to help the College assess its programs and services so that it may better serve you and others like yourself.

Please complete the following survey and return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. All responses will be kept confidential. Your assistance in this survey is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Parilla

Robert E. Parilla
President

---

(032) 1. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

1 ____ Less than high school diploma
2 ____ High school diploma/GED
3 ____ One-year college certificate
4 ____ Associate degree
5. ____ Bachelor's degree (four years)
6. ____ Master's degree
7. ____ Doctoral degree
8. ____ Other, specify: ____________________

(033-042) 2. Why did you choose Montgomery College? (Check all that apply)

1 ____ Low tuition
2 ____ Convenient location
3 ____ Offers desired programs
4 ____ Reputation of college
5 ____ Recommended by friend
6 ____ Reputation of faculty
7. ____ Recommended by family members
8 ____ Recommended by high school teacher/counselor
9. ____ Other, specify: ____________________
10. ____ All of the above

(043) 3. What is your goal while attending Montgomery College?
1 ____ Complete desired courses, not earn a degree or certificate
2 ____ Earn a certificate
3 ____ Earn the associate degree

(044) 4. How long do you anticipate it will take you to achieve your goal at Montgomery College?
1. ____ One semester
2 ____ Two semesters
3 ____ Three semesters
4 ____ Four semesters
5. ____ Five semesters
6. ____ Six or more semesters
7. ____ Do not know

(045) 5. What is your primary reason for attending Montgomery College?
1 ____ Explore new academic or career areas
2 ____ Preparation for immediate entry into a career
3 ____ Preparation for transfer to a four-year institution
4 ____ Update skills for career advancement
5 ____ Interest and self enrichment
6 ____ Other

How would you rate the following college activities and facilities? If you rate an item as poor, please state reason below.

Quality of Services

		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No knowledge/ No opinion
(046)	6. Quality of Instruction	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(047)	7. Course availability	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(048)	8. Availability of instructors	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(049)	9. Helpfulness of instructors in completing a course	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(050)	10. Courtesy of administrators and staff	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(051)	11. Courtesy of instructors	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(052)	12. Assessment testing	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(053)	13. Counseling/advising	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(054)	14. Admission application processing (Admissions)	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(055)	15. Processing course requests (Registration)	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(056)	16. Cashier processing of tuition/fee payments	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(057)	17. Student financial aid	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(058)	18. Job placement assistance	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(059)	19. Reading, writing, and language skills improvement programs	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(060)	20. Math skills improvement program	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____
(061)	21. Library services	1. ____	2 ____	3. ____	4. ____	5. ____

Quality of Conditions of Physical Facilities

		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No knowledge/ No opinion
(062)	22. Laboratory	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___	5. ___
(063)	23. Child care center	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___	5. ___
(064)	24. Classroom	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___	5. ___
(065)	25. Cafeteria	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___	5. ___
(066)	26. Athletic	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___	5. ___
(067)	27. Security	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___	5. ___
(068)	28. Social/recreation (game room, lounges, etc.)	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___	5. ___
(069)	29. Library	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___	5. ___
(070)	30. Bookstore	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___	5. ___
(071)	31. Parking lot (space availability)	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___	5. ___
(072)	32. Math skills center	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___	5. ___
(073)	33. Reading and writing center	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___	5. ___

Reasons for poor ratings: ______________________________

____

____

____

How would you rate the following College goals?

		Very Important	Important	Not Important	Undecided
(074)	34. Provide students with appropriate and essential education and training beyond high school	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(075)	35. Provide an environment to encourage life long learning	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(076)	36. Provide students with specific skills in career and transfer programs	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(077)	37. Provide assessment testing	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(078)	38. Provide courses and programs for updating job skills	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(079)	39. Provide courses and programs for retraining or new careers	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(080)	40. Provide quality programs and services	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(081)	41. Provide academic and career counseling	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(082)	42. Provide handicapped student services	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(083)	43. Provide review courses	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(084)	44. Maintain an open-door admissions policy	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(085)	45. Maintain low tuition and fees	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___

(086) 46. How would you, in general, assess the difficulty of your course work?
1 ____ Harder than I expected
2 ____ About what I expected
3. ____ Easier than I expected

(087) 47 Have the final grades you received accurately reflected your knowledge and performance in your course work?
1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No
3. ____ No final grades received

(088) 48. At what time is it most convenient for you to attend class?
1 ____ Morning
2 ____ Afternoon
3. ____ Evening
4. ____ Weekend

(089) 49. At what time(s) can't you attend class?
1 ____ Morning
2 ____ Afternoon
3. ____ Evening
4. ____ Weekend

(090) 50. For a typical 3-credit course, would you prefer to meet:
1. ____ Once a week for a 3 hour session for 15 weeks
2 ____ Twice a week for 1½ hours each session for 15 weeks
3 ____ Three times a week for 1 hour each session for 15 weeks
4 ____ Twice a week for a 3 hour session for 8 weeks
5 ____ Once a week for a 6 hour session for 8 weeks

(091) 51. Have you ever taken a college course through the television media?
1 ____ Yes
2. ____ No

(092) 52. Would you like to take a course via TV or cable?
1 ____ Yes
2. ____ No

(093-099) 53. How is your college education being paid for? (Please check all that apply)
1. ____ Self
2. ____ Parent/guardian
3 ____ Employer
4 ____ Spouse
5 ____ Financial Aid
6. ____ All of the above
7. ____ Other, please specify: ______________________
____

(100) 54. How do you commute to the College?
1 ____ Drive self
2 ____ Car pool
3 ____ Driven by family member or friend
4. ____ Public transportation
5. ____ Walk
6. ____ Bicycle or motorcycle

(101) 55. What radio station do you most frequently listen to?
1 ____ WASH
2 ____ WGAY
3 ____ WINX
4 ____ WJOK
5. ____ WKYS
6. ____ WMAL
7. ____ WTOP
8. ____ Other: ______________________

(102) 56. When?
1 ____ Morning
2. ____ Afternoon
3 ____ Evening

(103) 57. What television channel do you most frequently watch?

1. ____ 4 (WRC)
2. ____ 5 (WTTG)
3. ____ 7 (WJLA)
4. ____ 9 (WDVM)
5. ____ 26 (WETA)
6. ____ Other, specify: ____________________

(104) 58. When?

1. ____ Morning
2. ____ Afternoon
3. ____ Evening

(105) 59. What is your employment status?

1. ____ Employed full-time (more than 35 hours per week)
2. ____ Employed part-time
3. ____ Not employed
4. ____ Full-time homemaker

(106) 60. If employed, which of the following best describes your type of work?

1. ____ Professional or technical
2. ____ Sales worker or clerical
3. ____ Manager, proprietor or official
4. ____ Farmer or farm worker
5. ____ Craftsman
6. ____ Operator
7. ____ Laborer (except farm)
8. ____ Service worker
9. ____ Other, please explain: ____________________

(107-112) 61. In addition to being a student, please check all of the following categories that may apply to you.

1. ____ Senior citizen
2. ____ Living alone
3. ____ Single parent
4. ____ Parent of young children
5. ____ Veteran
6. ____ None of the above

Please indicate whether or not you knew the following about the College and if you feel it is a positive or negative attribute for the College?

		Knew It		Feel it is	
		Yes	No	Positive	Negative
(113-114)	62. It has three campuses.	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____
(115-116)	63. You can complete the A.A. degree requirements for some programs through evening study.	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____
(117-118)	64. It is the only public institution of higher education headquartered in the County.	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____
(119-120)	65. It provides academic and career counseling services.	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____
(121-122)	66. It provides support services for the handicapped student.	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____
(123-124)	67. Sixty-nine percent of its students are part-time.	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____
(125-126)	68. Over 85 percent of its graduates are employed.	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____
(127-128)	69. Over 50 percent of its graduates transfer to upper division schools.	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____
(129-130)	70. Over 40,000 students attend each year in credit and non-credit courses.	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____
(131-132)	71. The library on each campus is open on the weekend.	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____
(133-134)	72. The recreation facilities on each campus are open to all students.	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____
(135-136)	73. It has a student activities program.	1. ____	2. ____	3. ____	4. ____

(137) 74. Do you believe students need photo I.D. cards?

1 ____ Yes
2. ____ No

(138) 75. If you answered "yes" to the above question, would you be willing to pay a small service charge for this card?

1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No

(139) 76. How long have you lived at your current address?

1 ____ Less than 1 year
2 ____ 1–4 years
3. ____ 5–10 years
4. ____ More than 10 years

(140) 77. How long have you lived within commuting distance of Montgomery College?

1 ____ Less than 1 year
2 ____ 1–4 years
3. ____ 5–10 years
4. ____ More than 10 years

(141) 78. What is the approximate income of your household before taxes?

1 ____ Less than $5,000
2. ____ $5,000–$9,999
3. ____ $10,000–$14,999
4. ____ $15,000–$19,999
5 ____ $20,000–$24,999
6 ____ $25,000–$29,999
7. ____ $30,000–$34,999
8. ____ $35,000–$39,999
9. ____ $40,000–$49,999
10. ____ $50,000 and over
11. ____ Don't know

(142) 79. Do the College catalog descriptions accurately reflect the subjects taught in courses you have taken?

1 ____ Yes
2. ____ No

If "no", please explain: ______________________________

____

____

(143) 80. Did you find the class schedule for the current semester to be a highly usable publication?

1 ____ Yes
2. ____ No

If "no", how can it be improved? ______________________________

____

____

81. What program or service not already offered at the College would you like to have available?

Please specify: ______________________________

____

____

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.

Current Student Survey Report
Part 4:
Communicating with Students About Montgomery College

Montgomery College
Office of Institutional Research
Montgomery County, Maryland
March 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables ii

Executive Summary. iii

Introduction: Current Student Survey. 1
  Comparison of Questionnaire Respondents with All Fall 1983 Students. 3

Communicating with Students about Montgomery College 7
  Knowledge About Montgomery College 7
  Television Channels Watched by Respondents 10
  Time of Television Viewing 12
  Radio Station Listened to Most Frequently. 12
  Time of Radio Listening. 14
  The Need for Student Photo I.D. Cards. 15
  Requests for Information: Responses to Open-Ended Questions 16

Summary and Conclusions. 19

Appendix: Questionnaire 23

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students. 5

2. What Television Channel Do You Most Frequently Watch?. 11

3. What Time During the Day Do You Most Frequently Watch Television? 12

4. Radio Station Listened to Most Frequently 13

5. At What Time During the Day Do You Most Frequently Listen to the Radio?. 14

6. Yes, Students Need Photo I.D. Cards 15

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Title: Current Student Survey Report
Part 4: Communicating with Students about Montgomery College

Purpose: This report presents data obtained from students enrolled at Montgomery College during the fall 1983 semester on the following subjects: students' knowledge about Montgomery College, students' media use, topics about which students requested more information, and student opinions on the need for a photo identification card. Comparisons are made of the responses of students grouped by campus, full-time and part-time status, time of class attendance, sex, racial and ethnic status, residences and credits transferred to Montgomery College. The information should be helpful in efforts to communicate more effectively with students.

Methodology: A questionnaire was sent during the month of November, 1983 to all students enrolled in credit courses. Those students not responding were sent a follow-up questionnaire. The response rate was 35.7 percent of the student body (7,254/20,314). The respondents are proportionally representative of the fall student body on campus of enrollment, full-time/part-time status, time of class attendance, residence and credits transferred to Montgomery College. Somewhat underrepresented in the respondents are students under 30 years of age, males and minorities.

Limitations: Some of the questions designed to discover what students knew about the College may have been too specific (requiring knowledge of numbers and percentages) to provide very useful information. Questions asking for more general knowledge about the College and its students may have been a more realistic test of what the College would like students to know.

Summaries of written responses to open-ended questions are included in this report. Problems of interpretation, legibility and categorization reduce the precision and validity of this data. These questions appeared at the end of the rather long questionnaire, and may not have received the amount of attention from the respondents which would be desirable.

Findings: Students were asked whether they knew certain facts about the College, and to evaluate each fact as a positive or negative characteristic. All of the facts listed were regarded as positive characteristics by large majorities of the respondents. The facts about the College most widely known were those about the programs and services available to students. The facts that were not widely known had to do with the charateristics and size of the student body and the activities of the graduates. The percentages of total College respondents knowing the facts ranged from 97 percent who knew that Montgomery College has three campuses to 20 percent who knew that over 85 percent of its graduates are employed.

The least informed group were students attending classes off-campus. A majority of these students did not know that the College has a student activities program, recreational facilities open to all students, support services for handicapped students, and that the libraries are open on weekends.

Evening students also tended to be less informed about the services provided by the College. About half did not know that there is a student activities program, that recreational facililties are open to all students, and that the libraries are open on weekends.

Other "information gaps" were discovered. Forty-two percent of the part-time students did not know that recreational facilities are open to all students. Forty-six percent of the Takoma Park students did not know that the library is open on weekends. About one-third of the Takoma Park and Germantown students did not know of the support services for handicapped students. Twenty-two percent of the nonresidents did not know that the College provides academic and career counseling.

Groups that tended to be less knowledgeable about the twelve items about the College were the off-campus students, evening students, nonresidents and Maryland residents. Groups that tended to be more knowledgeable about the twelve items were the transfer students, full-time students, Germantown students, Asian students and Hispanic students.

The most popular television channel was Channel 7 (WJLA), chosen by 34 percent of the total College respondents and by the largest proportion of all student groups as the channel most frequently watched. Channel 9 (WDVM) was the next most popular station. It was watched most frequently by 17 percent of the total College respondents. About 90 percent of all student groups watched television most frequently in the evening.

The students listened to many different radio stations. No station was chosen by more than 14 percent of the students. The most popular radio stations were WRQX and WWDC which were chosen by 14 percent and 12 percent of the students respectively. The majority of all but three student groups listened to the radio most often in the morning. Asian students, non-resident students, and Black students had somwhat larger percentages listening to the radio in the evening.

Student groups differed considerably on the need for student photo identification cards. The percentages ranged from 33 to 71 percent feeling that such a card was needed. There were significant differences among the campuses, between full-time and part-time students, between day and evening students, between minority and non-minority students, and between Montgomery County residents and the students not residing in the County. The majority of students in the following groups felt there was a need for a photo I.D. card: Takoma Park students, full-time students, day students, minority students, Maryland residents and non-residents. Based on replies primarily, but not entirely, from students who had answered affirmatively on the need for the card, about two-thirds were willing to pay a small service charge for such a card.

A relatively small number of respondents requested more information about the College in their responses to the open-ended questions. Most of these requests came from students who had given negative ratings to the accuracy of the course descriptions in the College Catalog and on the usefulness of the Fall 1983 Class Schedule. More than 90 percent of the respondents gave positive ratings to these two publications, probably the most important sources of written information about the College (Current Student Survey, Part I, page 39). Those that gave negative ratings were asked to explain why.

Although categorization and interpretation of these written responses is somewhat problematic, a lack of detail in course descriptions in the Catalog is apparently a more pervasive problem than inaccuracy. One hundred forty-eight students cited the need for more information about courses, particularly about intellectual level, depth of coverage, student workload and necessary skill level. Sixty-six students said that the descriptions were not accurate, 27 of them mentioning the variability of teachers. Sixty-nine students cited problems with specific courses.

The most frequently given reason for feeling that the class schedule was not useful was the number of TBA's. Students wanted to know who was teaching the course, a piece of information especially hard to obtain for evening, weekend, and off-campus courses.

Fifty-six students requested more information, or more accessible information, about College services and activities. Most of these requests had to do with perceived inadequacies of the Fall 1983 Class Schedule, many of which have already been corrected. The small type was the most frequent complaint about the class schedule. Most of the requests for more information about College services and activities came from evening students, who suggested such things as an orientation program for new students, a separate publication outlining services available, more detailed campus maps, and more publicity for extracurricular activities and events.

Discussion: Ideally, all students should know about all available services. Possibly many off-campus students and evening students had little interest in using these services and therefore did not read the information available. The relatively small number of information requests and the good ratings of the College Catalog and Course Schedule may support this premise. However, this is clearly not true in all cases, especially for evening students, and it seems that efforts to improve communication with them would be appreciated.

The students' lack of knowledge about characteristics of the student body and graduates is probably less important. It may be that many students did not know the numbers and percentages in question, but did know these facts in a general way. Since all the characteristics were considered to be positive, it would probably be good for the College if students did know these things, at least in a general way. The questionnaire did not probe for that general knowledge.

Much of the additional information about courses that students wanted probably would not be appropriate in the College Catalog descriptions, but perhaps more information on what is expected of the student could be included. The College's rather liberal drop-add policy is one way of addressing this problem. However, a more ideal way, both for the student and for the institution, is good academic advising.

A look at the Spring 1985 Class Schedule reveals that the College is no more forthcoming on who is teaching evening, weekend and off-campus courses than it was in fall 1983. The use of many part-time faculty, whose teaching assignments are maneuverable until a few days before classes begin, means that this communication gap will most likely continue. It is not surprising that students want this information on the teacher assigned to the course, and perhaps enrollment in evening, weekend, and off-campus courses would increase if it were provided.

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The Current Student Survey is one of five components of a Community Assessment Program study being conducted by the College's Office of Institutional Research. The purpose of the Current Student Survey is to find out from currently enrolled students their opinions on the quality of College programs, services and facilities; their perception and knowledge of the College; their educational goals and expectations; their preferences on class scheduling; their use of the media; and a number of demographic factors. The data will be used to determine how well the College is meeting the educational needs of its students and how to better communicate with them.

The reports on the Current Student Survey will be issued in several parts based on the following topics:

1. Student Evaluation of Montgomery College
2. Educational Goals and Reasons for Attending MC
3. Knowledge about Montgomery College
4. Media Use
5. Preferences on Class Scheduling
6. Demographics
7. Open-ended responses

It was thought important to find out if there are differences in the opinions and needs of several subgroups in the student population. Therefore, the data obtained will be analyzed so as to compare the responses of the following student groups: students enrolled at the different campuses and at off-campus locations; students attending in the day, evening and day/evening; students enrolled full-time and part-time; males and females; Asian, Black, and Hispanic students; students who have transferred to Montgomery College; and Montgomery County residents, Maryland residents, and nonresidents.

Methodology

In the fall semester of 1983, 20,314 students were enrolled in credit courses on all three campuses and at off-campus locations. All students were sent a questionnaire during the month of November, 1983, and those not responding were sent a follow-up questionnaire. Seven thousand two hundred and fifty-four (7,254) completed questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate of 35.7 percent of the student body (7254/20314).

Since no question on the questionnaire was answered by all respondents, the number (N) of student respondents will differ somewhat for each question. The total College N will not equal that of all students identified by campus, as about 200 respondents tore off the identifying label on the questionnaire. These are included only in the total College N.

Chi square was used to test the statistical significance of the difference among the groups. Two levels of confidence ($p < .01$ and $p < .05$) were established for the groups depending on size. A five percent difference between groups of students consisting of approximately 1,000 individuals or more, as in the case of students divided by campus, is statistically significant at the .01 level. This means that we can be fairly certain that a five percent difference found is not by chance, and that there is a real, however small difference between groups. Most of the comparisons done in this study are among groups of this size or larger. Thus, a five percent difference will be statistically significant for most comparisons.

Larger differences are needed to reach statistical significance when comparing smaller groups of students. Groups consisting of about 400 individuals in our study are Asians, Blacks, transfers, and off-campus students. For these comparisons, about a ten percent difference is needed to reach statistical significance at the .01 level of confidence and an eight percent difference for the .05 level of confidence. Even greater differences are necessary for smaller groups included here such as Hispanics, and nonresidents.

Differences reported as statistically significant may not always have practical significance. Practical significance, or the importance of the differences, is left to the judgment of the reader.

A Comparison of Questionnaire Respondents with All Fall 1983 Students

To ascertain the representativeness of the respondents to the total student body, comparisons of respondents and the total student population on key variables were made. Information on the total student population is taken from the OIR publication, entitled, "Profile of Students Enrolled at MC during Fall Semester of 1983", and from internal records of the College. Comparison of the respondents and the fall 1983 student body on the variables of campus, full-time/part-time status, time of class attendance, residence and transfer status revealed no significant differences between groups. The percentage of respondents falling into these subgroups parallels that of the total student body. There were, however, some differences on age, sex, and minority status.

Age

Based on adjusted percentages, 62 percent of the respondents as compared to 70 percent of the fall 1983 student body were under 30 years of age. The respondents are a little older than the student body in general. The biggest discrepancy is in the 20-29 age group, which is underrepresented by five percent in our sample. This underrepresentation of younger students is similar for all campuses, and is a statistically significant difference.

Sex

Using adjusted percentages, the male student population is underrepresented in the respondents by five percent, a statistically significant difference.

Minority Status

The three groups that comprise our minority category, Asian, Black, and Hispanic students, were 15 percent of the respondents and 20 percent of the fall student body. It is primarily the Black students who are underrepresented, making up eight percent of the replies and eleven percent of the fall 1983 students.

Many students, both in the sample and in the total student population, could not be categorized by race or ethnicity. The "unknown" category is 19 percent of the sample and 17 percent of the fall 1983 student body. It is possible, of course, that some of the "unknowns" are minority students and that this group, in reality, is not underrepresented.

The minority respondents, like minorities in the total student body, are unevenly distributed among the campuses. Enrollment patterns of Black, Asian and Hispanic respondents by campus parallel that of these students in the fall 1983 student body. Sixty percent of the Black respondents were enrolled at Takoma Park, 33 percent at Rockville, and four percent at Germantown. Sixty percent of the Asian respondents were enrolled at Rockville, 30 percent at Takoma Park and three percent at Germantown. The enrollment of Hispanic respondents by campus differed slightly, but not significantly, from that of the Hispanic students enrolled in fall 1983. About two thirds of the Hispanic students were enrolled at Rockville and about one third were enrolled at Takoma Park in fall 1983. A slightly larger percentage of Hispanic survey respondents were enrolled at Rockville (68%) and a slightly smaller percentage were enrolled at the Takoma Park Campus (27%).

TABLE 1

Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students

		Respondents N = 7254			Fall 1983 Students N = 20314	
		N	%	Adj. %	N	%
Campus	Germantown	946	13	14	2397	12
	Rockville	4222	58	60	12369	61
	Takoma Park	1434	20	20	4291	21
	Off-Campus	451	6	6	1257	6
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Credits	Full-time	2005	28	28	6190	30
	Part-time	5048	70	72	14124	70
	Unknown	201	2	-		
	Total	7254	100	100%	20314	100%
Time	Day	3710	51	53	11061	54
	Evening	2383	33	34	6414	32
	Day/Eve	960	13	14	2839	14
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Residence	Montgomery Co.	6487	90	92	18424	91
	Maryland	251	3	4	819	4
	Nonresidents	315	4	4	1071	5
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Sex	Male	2758	38	39	9035	44
	Female	4295	59	61	11279	56
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%

TABLE 1 (Continued)
Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students

	Respondents N = 7254			Fall 1983 Students N = 20314		
	N	%	Adj. %	N	%	Adj. %
Age						
15-19 years	1296	18	19	4366	22	
20-29 years	2989	41	43	9808	48	
30-39 years	1322	18	19	3270	16	
40-49 years	633	9	9	1505	7	
50 and over	666	9	10	1365	7	
Unknown	348	5	-	-	-	
Total	7254	100	100	20314	100	
Race and Ethnicity						
Asian	443	6	7	1446	7	9
Black	460	6	8	1865	9	11
Hispanic	216	3	4	787	4	5
White	4654	64	79	12153	60	72
Other	138	2	2	510	3	3
Unknown	1343	19	-	3553	17	-
	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%	100%
Transfers						
1 - 15 credits	417	6		1033	5	
16 or more credits	478	7		1036	5	
	895	13%		2069	10	

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY REPORT

PART 4: COMMUNICATING WITH STUDENTS ABOUT MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

This report includes data on students' knowledge about Montgomery College, media use, topics about which they requested more information, and opinions on the need for a photo identification card.

The questionnaire included the following:

1) Twelve questions to discover if the student knew certain facts about the College.
2) A request to evaluate each of the twelve facts presented.
3) Four questions on television viewing habits and on radio listening habits.
4) Requests for explanation of a negative evaluation of the College Catalog and Class Schedule.
5) Two questions on the issue of a photo I.D. card.
6) One question asking what services or programs the student would like to have available.

This information is analyzed by question and includes comparisons of the responses of students grouped by campus, full-time and part-time status, time of class attendance, sex, minority status, residence, and transfer of credits to Montgomery College.

Knowledge About Montgomery College

Students were asked whether they knew certain facts about the College, and to indicate whether each fact was a positive or negative attribute for the College. All items on the list were considered to be positive attributes by the majority of students, but the percentage of students knowing each fact listed ranged from 97 to 20 percent. The listed facts are presented below in order of the percent of total College respondents (TC) indicating knowledge of the fact.

Montgomery College has three campuses: known by 97 percent of TC. From 90 to 99 percent of all student groups knew this fact, and about 98 percent considered it a positive attribute. The least knowledgeable students were the off-campus students.

Montgomery College provides academic and career counseling services: known by 87 percent of TC. From 78 to 92 percent of all student groups knew this, and about 98 percent thought it a positive attribute. The least knowledgeable students were the nonresidents (78%) and the off-campus students (80%). The transfer students were the most knowledgeable.

You can complete the A.A. degree requirements for some programs through evening study: known by 80 percent of TC. From 69 to 88 percent of all student groups knew this and about 98 percent considered it a positive attribute. The least knowledgeable students were the nonresidents, Hispanics and Asian students. The most knowledgeable were the transfer students.

Montgomery College provides support services for the handicapped student: known by 70 percent of TC. From 50 to 87 percent of all student groups knew this and about 99 percent considered it positive. Least knowledgeable students were: off-campus (50%), evening (61%), Germantown (62%), and Maryland students (63%). The most knowledgeable were the day/evening students.

Montgomery College has a student activities program: known by 67 percent of TC. From 46 to 76 percent of all student groups knew this, and about 98 percent considered it positive. Least knowledgeable students were the off-campus (46%) and evening students (57%). Most knowledgeable were the full-time students.

The recreation facilities on each campus are open to all students: known by 63 percent of TC. From 36 to 75 percent of all student groups knew this and 99 percent considered it positive. Least knowledgeable students were the off-campus (36%) and evening students (49%). Most knowledgeable students were the full-time (75%), Germantown (74%), Hispanic (74%), and transfer students (74%).

The library on each campus is open on the weekend: known by 61 percent of TC. From 33 to 75 percent of all student groups knew this, and 99 percent considered it positive. Least knowledgeable students were: off-campus (33%), Maryland (50%), Takoma Park (54%), and evening students (51%). Most knowledgeable were the full-time (75%), Germantown (73%) and Asian students (71%).

Montgomery College is the only public institution of higher education headquartered in the County: known by 54 percent of TC. From 36 to 61 percent of all student groups knew this, and about 80 percent considered it a positive attribute. Least knowledgeable students were the non-residents (36%), Maryland residents (41%), Black students (44%) and Hispanic students (45%). This was one of the two items on the list considered by more than four percent of the respondents to be a negative attribute. From 15 to 24 percent of every student group viewed it negatively.

Over 50 percent of its graduates transfer to upper division schools: known by 36 percent of TC. From 24 to 47 percent of all student groups knew this, and about 98 percent considered it positive. Least knowledgeable students were the off-campus (24%) and evening students (28%). Most knowledgeable were the full-time students (45%), Asian students (47%) and Black students (44%).

Sixty-nine percent of its students are part-time: known by 25 percent of TC. From 20 to 29% of all student groups knew this, and about 87 percent considered it a positive attribute. Least knowledgeable students were the off-campus students. Most knowledgeable were the Germantown students. This was the second item considered to be a negative attribute by more than 4 percent of the respondents. The percentages of those viewing it negatively ranged from 7 to 27 percent. Asian students (27%) and full-time students (23%) had the largest percentage of negative responses.

Over 40,000 students attend each year in credit and non-credit courses: known by 22 percent of TC. From 14 to 30 percent of all student groups knew this, and about 96 percent considered it a positive attribute. Most knowledgeable were the Asian students (30%) and least knowledgeable were the off-campus students (14%). Thirteen percent of the Asian students considered this a negative attribute, the largest percentage of negative responses.

Over 85 percent of its graduates are employed: known by 20 percent of TC. From 15 to 32 percent of all student groups knew this, and about 96 percent viewed it positively. Least knowledgeable were the off-campus students (15%)

and most knowledgeable were the transfers of 16 or more credits (32%). Twelve percent of the Asian students considered this a negative attribute, the largest percentage of negative responses.

Television Channels Watched by Respondents

The television channels are ranked in order of the percent of the total College respondents (TC) saying they watched it most frequently. Groups listed as especially or more likely to watch the channel are those near the upper limit of the range of percentages given. Groups listed as less likely to watch were near the lower limit of that range of percentages.

Rank TV Channel

1 34% TC Channel 7 (WJLA) Range in percentages = 24 - 46%

The largest percentage of all student groups watched Channel 7 most frequently. Groups especially likely to watch Channel 7 were: Black students, full-time students, Asian students, Hispanic students and female students. Groups less likely to watch this channel were off-campus students and evening students.

2 17% TC Channel 9 (WDVM) Range in percentages = 10 - 24%

For most student groups, Channel 9 was most frequently watched by the next largest percentage of students. Groups especially likely to watch Channel 9 were: off-campus students, Germantown students, Maryland students, and evening students. Hispanic students were least likely to watch this channel.

3 16% TC Channel 4 (WRC) Range in percentages = 14 - 20%

There was little variation among groups in the percent watching Channel 4 most frequently. Groups more likely to watch this channel were males and Maryland residents. Groups less likely to watch Channel 4 were: females, off-campus students and Hispanic students.

4 14% TC Channel 26 (WETA) Range in percentages = 5 - 21%

Most groups were similar to the total College norm (14%) in the percent watching Channel 26 most frequently. The off-campus students watched it significantly more often. Groups less likely to watch this channel were Black students, full-time students, and Maryland residents.

5 12% TC Other Channels Range in percentages = 6 - 19%

Most groups varied little from the total College norm (12%) in the percent watching a channel not on the list. Asian and Black students were the ones least likely to watch another channel.

6 7% TC Channel 5 (WTTG) Range in percentages = 4 - 14%

Asian students and nonresidents were more likely to watch Channel 5 than other students. Off-campus students were least likely to watch this channel.

TABLE 2
TOTAL COLLEGE
WHAT TELEVISION CHANNEL DO YOU MOST FREQUENTLY WATCH?

		Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
4	(WRC)	920	16%
5	(WTTG)	387	7%
7	(WJLA)	1853	34%
9	(WDVM)	976	17%
26	(WETA)	760	14%
Other		690	12%
Total		5586	100%

Seventy-seven percent of the total College respondents answered this question. Response rates for all student groups ranged from 67 to 80 percent. Minority students and nonresidents had the lowest response rates.

Time of Television Viewing

Approximately 90 percent of all student groups said they watched television most frequently in the evening. The percentages ranged from a high of 96 percent of the off-campus students to a low of 85 percent of the full-time students.

About eight percent of most student groups watched television most frequently in the afternoon. The percentages ranged from 1 to 13 percent. The evening students and off-campus students were at the low end of the continuum and the full-time students were the ones most likely to watch television in the afternoon.

Only two to four percent of all student groups watched television most frequently in the morning.

TABLE 3

TOTAL COLLEGE

WHAT TIME DURING THE DAY DO YOU MOST FREQUENTLY WATCH TELEVISION?

	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Morning	146	2%
Afternoon	455	8%
Evening	5375	90%
Total	5976	100%

Eighty-two percent of the total College respondents answered this question. The response rate for all groups ranged from 80 to 90 percent.

Radio Station Listened to Most Frequently

Respondents were asked which radio station they listened to most frequently. Seven stations were listed along with "other" and a space in which to write the name of the other station. Sixty-three percent of the respondents checked "other", and 67 other radio station call letters were written in. Some of these call letters were incorrect or illegible, and so the summary statistics compiled from these responses are not complete; however, they are representative of the replies. The remaining "other" category in the table includes radio stations for which there were fewer than 200 listeners.

The radio station listened to most frequently is WRQX with over 14 percent of the respondents indicating it. It was followed by WWDC (12.0%), WAVA (8.1%), WKYX (6.8%), WLTT (6.7), and WASH (6.5%).

TABLE 4
TOTAL COLLEGE RESPONDENTS
RESPONSES TO QUESTION ON RADIO STATION LISTENED TO MOST FREQUENTLY

Station	Number of Responses	Percent of all Responses
WRQX	1077	14.3%
WWDC	900	12.0%
WAVA	604	8.1%
WKYX	510	6.8%
WLTT	500	6.7%
WASH	485	6.5%
WMAL	422	5.6%
WGAY	336	4.5%
WMZQ	326	4.3%
WTOP	315	4.2%
WGMS	290	3.9%
WPGC	280	3.7%
Other	1454	19.4%
	7499*	100.0%

*Some students gave more than one response.

Time of Radio Listening

Students were asked, "At what time of day do you listen most frequently to the radio?" For all but three student groups, the largest percentage listened to the radio most often in the morning. Asian students and nonresidents had larger numbers listening in the evening, and Black students had equal percentages listening in the morning and in the evening.

Fifty-four percent of the total College respondents listened most frequently to the radio in the morning. The percentages ranged from 39 to 63 percent. Germantown students had the largest percentage of morning listeners and Asian students had the smallest percentage.

Fifteen percent of the total College respondents listened most frequently in the afternoon. The percentages ranged from 5 to 18 percent. Day students, Hispanics, and transfer students were the groups with larger percentages of afternoon listeners.

Thirty-one percent of the total College respondents listened most frequently in the evening. The percentages ranged from 25 to 49 percent. Asian, non-resident, and Black students had the largest percentages, and Germantown students had the smallest percentage of evening radio listeners.

TABLE 5

TOTAL COLLEGE

AT WHAT TIME DURING THE DAY DO YOU MOST FREQUENTLY LISTEN TO THE RADIO?

	Number of Respondents	Percent of Respondents
Morning	1563	54%
Afternoon	446	15%
Evening	892	31%
	2901	100%

Forty percent of the total College respondents answered this question.

The Need for Student Photo I.D. Cards

Student groups differed considerably on the issue of the need for student photo I.D. cards. The percentages ranged from 33 to 71 percent agreeing that the cards were needed. The following table gives the percent answering affirmatively to the question.

TABLE 6

YES, STUDENTS NEED PHOTO I.D. CARDS

Group	Percent Yes
Total College	48%
Germantown	33%
Rockville	48%
Takoma Park	57%
Off-Campus	40%
Full-time	61%
Part-time	42%
Day	53%
Evening	39%
Day/Evening	50%
Males	50%
Females	46%
Asian	60%
Black	71%
Hispanic	66%
Non-Minority	42%
1-15 credits transferred	47%
16 or more credits transferred	37%
Montgomery County	46%
Maryland Resident	60%
Non-resident	70%

Ninety-one percent of the total College respondents answered this question.

Students who answered "yes" to the question about the need for photo I.D. cards were asked if they would be willing to pay a small service charge for the card. Fifty-three percent of the total College respondents answered the question. The number of replies from each student group exceeded the number of "yes" answers to the previous question on need for the card. In the cases of Germantown and evening students, 26 percent of the replies were from students who had not responded "yes" to the former question. These were the largest discrepancies.

Two-thirds of all the replies were affirmative; i.e., most students were willing to pay a small service charge for a photo I.D. card. The percentages of affirmative replies from all student groups ranged from 62 to 79 percent. Black students and Hispanic students had the largest percentages willing to pay a small charge. Since these responses include some students (18% overall) who had not seen the need for an I.D. card, the large percentage willing to pay for such a card is more significant than if it were only from those agreeing on the need for a card.

A few students made written comments on the issue of photo I.D. cards. The majority of comments related to the cost of the card. Thirteen felt the cost should be covered by existing fees, and nine emphasized that the fee should be minimal. One said no fee is charged by other area colleges for a photo I.D. card. Three thought the card should be optional. A few felt the card would be primarily of use off-campus in obtaining discounts.

Requests for Information: Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Three open-ended questions elicited requests for more information about the College and its programs. Students were asked to evaluate the accuracy of the course descriptions in the College Catalog and the usefulness of the Class Schedule publication. Those giving negative evaluations were asked to explain them. Most of the explanations were essentially requests for more or better information. The question about desirable programs or services not already offered by the College also elicited some requests for more information.

These requests fall into four major categories: more information about courses, more information about teachers, more information about services and College activities, and more personal advice about career and academic matters. The last category, personal advice, will be covered in another report.

More information about courses Three hundred forty-three students explained their reasons for feeling that the course descriptions in the College catalog were not accurate. Although 93 percent of the respondents thought that they were accurate, 440 respondents thought they were not (Current Student Survey Report: Part 1, page 39).

Of the 165 students who indicated the need for more information about the courses, 110 requested more detailed or specific information for courses in general. Twenty-four of these students indicated that the problem had to do with the level or intensity of the course content and the skill prerequisites of the intended student population, and some complained that the course was taught at a lower or higher level than expected. One student suggested that information on skill progression from course to course would be helpful. Eighteen students wanted information [illegible] student workload included in the course or curriculum descriptions. Seven requested information on the transferability of each course. Two students wanted information on the costs of course materials. One student wanted information on the relative importance of each course in a curriculum.

Seventy-six students indicated that the descriptions were not accurate or up-to-date. Thirty-three of these students mentioned the variability of the faculty teaching the courses: some teach in accordance with the catalog descriptions and some do not.

Six students requested the use of simpler language in the course descriptions. Six complained that several of the courses listed in the catalog were not offered. Six students said that they had not seen the catalog and hoped it would be more available. Seventy-six students cited problems with the descriptions of specific courses. A list of these courses will be available from OIR.

More information about teachers The most frequent complaint from the 130 students who explained their reasons for saying the Fall 1983 Class Schedule was not highly usable was the number of TBA's. Forty-seven students gave this reason, many of whom cited this as a special problem for night and weekend courses. Six students protested changes in the scheduled instructor. A number of students requested that student evaluations of teachers be available, a topic that will be covered in another report.

More information about services and College activities Fifty-six students, responding to the question about the class schedule publication and to the question about desired programs or services, asked that more information be available and suggested a variety of ways that this be done. Some suggestions pertained to the way information was presented in the Fall 1983 Class Schedule publication. Six students requested a separate publication outlining services available with hours and phone numbers. Four students requested a map showing where to register, pay, and find advisors and counselors. Four students requested an orientation program for new students, especially to include evening students. Eight students requested better publicity for extra curricular activities and department-sponsored events. Two suggested a campus radio station to do this. Suggested additions to the class schedule publication were: an index; medical insurance information; more information on CLEP exam procedures; location, hours, and phone numbers of academic departments; clearer information on registration for laboratory sciences; clearer information on dropping classes and refunds; the final exam schedule; a detailed list of new courses. Six students protested changes in courses scheduled (dropped) and requested an updated publication.

Suggested changes in the Fall 1983 Class Schedule publication Thirty-six students suggested changes in this publication, some of which have already been done and so they will not be included here. The small type was the most frequent complaint. Five students suggested the use of color coding. Four students preferred the previously used booklet format. Three students wanted courses listed by time and day rather than by campus and subject. One student felt it should more closely parallel the organization of the College Catalog. Four students requested that the class schedule be available earlier.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The facts about Montgomery College most widely known to the respondents were primarily those about the programs and services available to students. The facts that were not widely known had to do with characteristics and size of the student body and the activities of the graduates.

The least informed group were students attending classes off campus. A majority of the off-campus students did not know that the College has a student activities program, recreational facilities open to all students, support services for handicapped students, and that the libraries are open on weekends.

Evening students also tended to be less informed about the services provided by the College. About half did not know that there is a student activities program, that recreational facilities are open to all students, and that the libraries are open on weekends.

A few other "information gaps" discovered are:

> Forty-two percent of the part-time students did not know that the recreational facilities are open to all students.
>
> Forty-six percent of the Takoma Park students did not know that the library is open on weekends.
>
> About one-third of the Takoma Park and Germantown students did not know that support services are provided for handicapped students.
>
> Twenty-two percent of the non-residents did not know that the College provides academic and career counseling.

Ideally, all students should know about all the available services. Lack of knowledge about the characteristics of the student body and the graduates is probably less important. However, since most of the facts listed were considered to be positive attributes by at least 96 percent of the respondents, publicizing these facts might be beneficial. Relatively few students knew the size of the student body, the percentage of graduates who transfer, and the percentage of the graduates who are employed, all facts viewed positively by 96 percent of the respondents. Since more students viewed them as negative attributes, the large proportion of part-time students and the College being the only public institution of higher education headquartered in the County, may have lesser publicity value.

No radio station was listened to most often by a very large percentage of the respondents. The most popular stations were WRQX, chosen by 14% of the students, and WWDC, chosen by 12% of the students. Except for the Asian students, Black students, and nonresident students, the majority most frequently listened to the radio in the morning.

The most popular television channel was Channel 7 (WJLA), chosen by 34 percent of the total College respondents and attracting the largest proportion of all student groups. Channel 9 (WDVM), the next most popular station, was watched most frequently by 17 percent of the total College respondents. Approximately 90 percent of all student groups watched television most often in the evening.

There was no consensus on the need for photo I.D. cards for students. Although 48 percent of the total College respondents felt there was such a need, there were significant differences among the campuses, between full-time and part-time students, between day and evening students, between minority and non-minority students, and between Montgomery County residents and the students not residing in the County. In the following groups the majority of students felt there was a need for photo I.D. cards: Takoma Park students, full-time students, day students, minority students, Maryland residents and non-residents. Only about one-third of the Germantown students, evening students, and students transferring 16 or more credits to Montgomery College agreed that there was a need for such an identification card. Based on replies primarily, but not entirely, from students who had answered affirmatively regarding the need for such a card, about two-thirds of the students were willing to pay a small service charge for an I.D. card. Given these variations in opinion, perhaps the suggestion of an optional photo I.D. card is a good one.

A relatively small number of respondents requested more information about the College in their responses to the open-ended questions. No doubt the two College publications, the Catalog and the Class Schedule, are the most important written sources of information about the College. Since over 90 percent of the respondents rated positively the accuracy and usability of these publications, the small number of information requests adds some credibility to these positive evaluations. However, the fact that these questions appeared near the end of a rather long questionnaire most probably reduced the number of respondents willing to take the time to write thoughtful explanatory comments. Those that did write these comments, even though small in number, should probably be taken seriously.

Course descriptions are important pieces of information for the student. Lack of detail in these descriptions is apparently a more pervasive problem than inaccuracy. The respondents that specified the nature of this lack of detail primarily focused on the issue of intellectual level, depth of coverage, student workload and necessary skill level. Students also want to know the teacher assigned to the course, a piece of information especially hard to obtain for evening, weekend, and off-campus courses.

As might be expected from the findings discussed earlier in this report, requests for more information about College services and activities came mostly from evening students. As one student commented, "We evening students don't know what's going on."

MONTGOMERY COLLEGE
Current Student Survey
1983–1984

(Please make corrections if necessary.)

Place address label here.

____
(Name)

____
(Address)

____

Dear Montgomery College Student:

I sincerely hope that you are finding your experience at Montgomery College pleasant and rewarding.

As a student enrolled at Montgomery College in the 1983--1984 academic year, you are a necessary part of the Current Student Survey being conducted to help the College assess its programs and services so that it may better serve you and others like yourself.

Please complete the following survey and return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. All responses will be kept confidential. Your assistance in this survey is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Parilla

Robert E. Parilla
President

---

(032) 1. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

1 ___ Less than high school diploma
2 ___ High school diploma/GED
3 ___ One-year college certificate
4 ___ Associate degree
5 ___ Bachelor's degree (four years)
6 ___ Master's degree
7 ___ Doctoral degree
8 ___ Other, specify: ______________

(033-042) 2. Why did you choose Montgomery College? (Check all that apply)

1 ___ Low tuition
2 ___ Convenient location
3 ___ Offers desired programs
4 ___ Reputation of college
5 ___ Recommended by friend
6 ___ Reputation of faculty
7 ___ Recommended by family members
8 ___ Recommended by high school teacher/counselor
9 ___ Other, specify: ______________
10 ___ All of the above

(043) 3. What is your goal while attending Montgomery College?

1 ____ Complete desired courses, not earn a degree or certificate
2 ____ Earn a certificate
3 ____ Earn the associate degree

(044) 4. How long do you anticipate it will take you to achieve your goal at Montgomery College?

1 ____ One semester
2 ____ Two semesters
3 ____ Three semesters
4 ____ Four semesters
5 ____ Five semesters
6 ____ Six or more semesters
7 ____ Do not know

(045) 5. What is your primary reason for attending Montgomery College?

1 ____ Explore new academic or career areas
2 ____ Preparation for immediate entry into a career
3 ____ Preparation for transfer to a four-year institution
4 ____ Update skills for career advancement
5 ____ Interest and self enrichment
6 ____ Other

How would you rate the following college activities and facilities? If you rate an item as poor, please state reason below.

Quality of Services

		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No knowledge/ No opinion
(046)	6. Quality of Instruction	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(047)	7. Course availability	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(048)	8. Availability of instructors	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(049)	9. Helpfulness of instructors in completing a course	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(050)	10. Courtesy of administrators and staff	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(051)	11. Courtesy of instructors	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(052)	12. Assessment testing	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(053)	13. Counseling/advising	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(054)	14. Admission application processing (Admissions)	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(055)	15. Processing course requests (Registration)	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(056)	16. Cashier processing of tuition/fee payments	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(057)	17. Student financial aid	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(058)	18. Job placement assistance	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(059)	19. Reading, writing, and language skills improvement programs	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(060)	20. Math skills improvement program	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____
(061)	21. Library services	1 ____	2 ____	3 ____	4 ____	5 ____

Quality of Conditions of Physical Facilities

		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No knowledge/ No opinion
(062)	22. Laboratory	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(063)	23. Child care center	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(064)	24. Classroom	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(065)	25. Cafeteria	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(066)	26. Athletic	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(067)	27. Security	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(068)	28. Social/recreation (game room, lounges, etc.)	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(069)	29. Library	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(070)	30. Bookstore	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(071)	31. Parking lot (space availability)	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(072)	32. Math skills center	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(073)	33. Reading and writing center	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___

Reasons for poor ratings: ____

____

____

____

How would you rate the following College goals?

		Very Important	Important	Not Important	Undecided
(074)	34. Provide students with appropriate and essential education and training beyond high school	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(075)	35. Provide an environment to encourage life long learning	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(076)	36. Provide students with specific skills in career and transfer programs	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(077)	37. Provide assessment testing	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(078)	38. Provide courses and programs for updating job skills	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(079)	39. Provide courses and programs for retraining or new careers	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(080)	40. Provide quality programs and services	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(081)	41. Provide academic and career counseling	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(082)	42. Provide handicapped student services	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(083)	43. Provide review courses	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(084)	44. Maintain an open-door admissions policy	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(085)	45. Maintain low tuition and fees	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___

(086) 46. How would you, in general, assess the difficulty of your course work?
1 ____ Harder than I expected
2 ____ About what I expected
3 ____ Easier than I expected

(087) 47. Have the final grades you received accurately reflected your knowledge and performance in your course work?
1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No
3 ____ No final grades received

(088) 48. At what time is it most convenient for you to attend class?
1. ____ Morning
2. ____ Afternoon
3. ____ Evening
4. ____ Weekend

(089) 49. At what time(s) can't you attend class?
1 ____ Morning
2 ____ Afternoon
3 ____ Evening
4 ____ Weekend

(090) 50. For a typical 3-credit course, would you prefer to meet:
1 ____ Once a week for a 3 hour session for 15 weeks
2 ____ Twice a week for 1½ hours each session for 15 weeks
3 ____ Three times a week for 1 hour each session for 15 weeks
4 ____ Twice a week for a 3 hour session for 8 weeks
5 ____ Once a week for a 6 hour session for 8 weeks

(091) 51. Have you ever taken a college course through the television media?
1 ____ Yes
2. ____ No

(092) 52. Would you like to take a course via TV or cable?
1 ____ Yes
2. ____ No

93–099) 53. How is your college education being paid for? (Please check all that apply)
1 ____ Self
2 ____ Parent/guardian
3 ____ Employer
4 ____ Spouse
5 ____ Financial Aid
6 ____ All of the above
7. ____ Other, please specify: ____________________

____

(100) 54. How do you commute to the College?
1 ____ Drive self
2 ____ Car pool
3 ____ Driven by family member or friend
4. ____ Public transportation
5. ____ Walk
6 ____ Bicycle or motorcycle

(101) 55. What radio station do you most frequently listen to?
1 ____ WASH
2 ____ WGAY
3 ____ WINX
4 ____ WJOK
5 ____ WKYS
6 ____ WMAL
7 ____ WTOP
8 ____ Other: ____________________

(102) 56. When?
1 ____ Morning
2 ____ Afternoon
3 ____ Evening

(103) 57. What television channel do you most frequently watch?

1. ___ 4 (WRC)
2. ___ 5 (WTTG)
3. ___ 7 (WJLA)
4. ___ 9 (WDVM)
5. ___ 26 (WETA)
6. ___ Other, specify: ______________________

(104) 58. When?

1. ___ Morning
2. ___ Afternoon
3. ___ Evening

(105) 59. What is your employment status?

1. ___ Employed full-time (more than 35 hours per week)
2. ___ Employed part-time
3. ___ Not employed
4. ___ Full-time homemaker

(106) 60. If employed, which of the following best describes your type of work?

1. ___ Professional or technical
2. ___ Sales worker or clerical
3. ___ Manager, proprietor or official
4. ___ Farmer or farm worker
5. ___ Craftsman
6. ___ Operator
7. ___ Laborer (except farm)
8. ___ Service worker
9. ___ Other, please explain: ______________________

(107–112) 61. In addition to being a student, please check all of the following categories that may apply to you.

1. ___ Senior citizen
2. ___ Living alone
3. ___ Single parent
4. ___ Parent of young children
5. ___ Veteran
6. ___ None of the above

Please indicate whether or not you knew the following about the College and if you feel it is a positive or negative attribute for the College?

		Knew it		Feel it is	
		Yes	No	Positive	Negative
(113–114)	62. It has three campuses.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(115–116)	63. You can complete the A.A. degree requirements for some programs through evening study.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(117–118)	64. It is the only public institution of higher education headquartered in the County.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(119–120)	65. It provides academic and career counseling services.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(121–122)	66. It provides support services for the handicapped student.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(123–124)	67. Sixty-nine percent of its students are part-time.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(125–126)	68. Over 85 percent of its graduates are employed.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(127–128)	69. Over 50 percent of its graduates transfer to upper division schools.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(129–130)	70. Over 40,000 students attend each year in credit and non-credit courses.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(131–132)	71. The library on each campus is open on the weekend.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(133–134)	72. The recreation facilities on each campus are open to all students.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(135–136)	73. It has a student activities program.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___

---

(137) 74. Do you believe students need photo I.D. cards?

1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No

(138) 75. If you answered "yes" to the above question, would you be willing to pay a small service charge for this card?

1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No

(139) 76. How long have you lived at your current address?

1 ____ Less than 1 year
2 ____ 1-4 years
3 ____ 5-10 years
4 ____ More than 10 years

(140) 77. How long have you lived within commuting distance of Montgomery College?

1 ____ Less than 1 year
2 ____ 1-4 years
3 ____ 5-10 years
4 ____ More than 10 years

(141) 78. What is the approximate income of your household before taxes?

1 ____ Less than $5,000
2 ____ $5,000-$9,999
3 ____ $10,000-$14,999
4 ____ $15,000-$19,999
5 ____ $20,000-$24,999
6 ____ $25,000-$29,999
7 ____ $30,000-$34,999
8 ____ $35,000-$39,999
9 ____ $40,000-$49,999
10 ____ $50,000 and over
11 ____ Don't know

(142) 79. Do the College catalog descriptions accurately reflect the subjects taught in courses you have taken?

1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No

If "no", please explain: ____

____

____

(143) 80. Did you find the class schedule for the current semester to be a highly usable publication?

1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No

If "no", how can it be improved? ____

____

____

81 What program or service not already offered at the College would you like to have available?

Please specify: ____

____

____

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY REPORT

PART 5: DEMOGRAPHICS OF STUDENTS ATTENDING MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

April 1985

Office of Institutional Research
William E. Campbell, Director
Marilynn P. Smith, Administrative Associate

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Executive Summary iii

Introduction: Current Student Survey. 1

List of Tables. 7

Demographics of Montgomery College Students Overview of All Questions and All Groups 8

- Education Completed. 9
- Employment Status. 9
- Type of Work 10
- Household Income 11
- Sources of Money for College 11
- Time at Current Address and within Commuting Distance to MC 12
- How Students Commute to MC 13
- Other Characteristics. 13
- Explanation of "Other" Responses. 14

Demographic Data by Campus 15

- Germantown Students 15
- Rockville Students. 15
- Takoma Park Students. 16
- Off-Campus Students 16

Significant Differences Among Student Groups 20

- Day, Evening, and Day/Evening Students. 20
- Full-Time and Part-Time Students. 22
- Asian, Black, and Hispanic Students 24
- Male and Female Students. 26
- Montgomery County, Maryland, and Nonresident Students. 27
- Students Transferring Credits to MC 28

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Title: Current Student Survey Report
Part 5: Demographics of Montgomery College Students

Purpose: This report presents the information, obtained by a questionnaire from students enrolled at MC in fall 1983, on their amount of education, employment status, type of work, household income, sources of money for college, length of residency, means of commuting to college, senior status, parental status, veteran status and household size. It adds to our knowledge of the characteristics of the student population.

Methodology: A questionnaire was sent during the month of November, 1983 to all students enrolled in credit courses on and off-campus. Those students not responding were sent a follow-up questionnaire. The response rate was 35.7 percent of the student body (7,254/20,314). The respondents are proportionally representtative of the fall student body on campus of enrollment, full-time/part-time status, time of class attendance, residence and credits transferred to Montgomery College. Somewhat underrepresented in the respondents are students under 30 years of age, males and minorities.

The data has been analyzed by campus, time of class attendance, full-time/part-time status, racial/ethnic status, credits transferred, residence, and sex. Statistically significant differences are reported; i.e., those that reach the .01 or .05 level of confidence.

Limitations: The question on household income was answered by only 56 percent of the respondents, and most likely the validity and reliability of the responses is reduced by the usual problems in questions of this type. Older students are somewhat overrepresented in the respondents and minorities are somewhat underrepresented. The summary statistics for items that vary with age and minority status, such as amount of education, household income, employment status, type of work, length of residency, parental and senior citizen status, can be expected to reflect these differences between the respondents and the general student population. In other words, generalizing from the respondents to the general student population is somewhat problematic.

Findings: The data has been analyzed to show variations among student groups and to provide a demographic picture of the student population of the total College (TC). Many statistically significant differences were found, many already well documented in other reports.

Education: The majority of the students (TC) had no more than a high school diploma, but several groups of students had quite large percentages with more education. There was more variation in the proportions having a Bachelor's, Master's, or Doctoral degree than in the proportions having a one-year college certificate or an A.A. degree. While 22 percent (TC) had a Bachelor's degree or better, this was true of 48 percent of the off-campus students, 37 percent of the evening students, 30 percent of the part-time students, and 28 percent of the students who had transferred 16 or more credits to the College. Student groups less likely to have more than a high school diploma were the full-time students (81%), and the day, day/evening, Hispanic, and nonresident students in which about two-thirds had a high school diploma or GED as their highest degree.

Employment: Three-quarters of the students (TC) were employed either full-time (43%) or part-time (32%). Except for the nonresidents, at least two-thirds of all student groups were employed either full or part-time The proportion of full-time workers varied a great deal, from seven percent of the full-time students to 83 percent of the evening students. Large percentages of full-time workers were found in the off-campus (78%), part-time (58%), and Germantown (53%) student groups.

Type of Work: Almost two-thirds of the employed students (TC) worked in one of two of the nine job categories listed: professional or technical, and sales or clerical. The percentages of professional or technical workers varied the most among student groups, ranging from 63 percent of the off-campus students to 14 percent of the full-time students. The full-time students were most likely to have sales or clerical jobs. The largest percentage of managers, proprietors or officials were Germantown students (8%). The largest percentage of service workers were Asian students (20%). Only seven percent of the students (TC) were non-farm laborers, craftsmen, operators, farmers or farm workers. The category "Other" was checked by 17 percent of the students (TC), and the largest percentage was found in the Hispanic student group (23%). Most of the "other" work cited was semi-skilled service work.

Household Income: The data on household income before taxes has been divided into five income categories: less than $10,000, $10,000-$19,999, $20,000-$29,999, $30,000-$39,999, and $40,000 or more.

Fourteen percent of the students (TC) reported a household income of less than $10,000. Thirty-six percent of the Asian students reported an income this low. About one-fourth of the Black students, Hispanic students, nonresidents, and full-time students reported an income at this level.

Twenty-five percent of the students (TC) indicated an income of $10,000-$19,999. Thus 39 percent (14% + 25%) reported an income of less than $20,000. Student groups with significantly greater numbers in these two income categories were Asian students (68%), Hispanic students (60%), Black students (56%), nonresidents (57%), Takoma Park students (51%) and full-time students (51%).

Forty-four percent of the students (TC) reported an income of $20,000-$40,000. Only the Germantown students (53%) and off-campus students (54%) had significantly larger percentages within this income range.

Seventeen percent of the students (TC) reported an income of $40,000 or more. The only group with significantly more in the top income category were the Germantown students (23%). As would be expected, significantly fewer minority students and Takoma Park students reported incomes this high. This was also true of day/evening students, but it was not true of nonresidents and full-time students.

Sources of Money for College: Respondents were asked to check all their sources of money for their college education. The largest proportion of most student groups checked "self" as a source. There was considerable variation in the percentages indicating parents/guardians, employers, and financial aid as sources of college money. Parental support was received by 56 percent of the full-time students, 51 percent of the nonresidents, and by about one-third of the day, day/evening, Rockville, Hispanic, and male students. For all other groups, no more than one quarter received college money from parents or guardians.

Employers provided money for college for 42 percent of the off-campus students, 31 percent of the evening students, 31 percent of the Maryland residents, 23 percent of the Germantown students, and 21 percent of the part-time students. Employer support was received by 15 percent of the total College students, and for most of the other student groups, smaller percentages received college money from employers.

Financial aid was received by 39 percent of the Asian students, the group with the largest percentage of financial aid recipients. Thirteen percent of the total College students reported receiving financial aid, and about one-fourth of the full-time students, day/evening students, Takoma Park students, Blacks, Hispanics, and Maryland residents reported this source of college money.

Nine percent of the students (TC) checked "spouse" as a source of money for college, a percentage exceeded somewhat in the responses of females, Germantown students and transfers of 16 or more credits.

Residency: Minority students and nonresidents had lived at their current address for a shorter period of time than students in general, with about one-quarter of the Asian and Hispanic students, and about one-third of the nonresidents indicating a period of less than one year. While 41 percent of the nonminority students had resided at their current address for less than five years, this was true of 81 percent of the Asian students, 74 percent of the Hispanic students, 64 percent of the Black students, and 74 percent of the nonresidents.

Most students had lived within commuting distance of the College longer than they had lived at their current address. Only 27 percent of the students (TC) indicated a time period of less than five years. The differences reported above between minority and nonminority students remain true.

Also, more Takoma Park students than students enrolled at other campuses had lived within commuting distance less than five years.

How Students Commute to MC: From 56-95 percent of all student groups said they drove themselves to the College. About 90 percent of the Germantown, off-campus, evening, nonminority, and part-time students used this means of commuting. The other major mode used was public transportation. This was used by approximately one-fourth to one-third of the Asian, Black, Hispanic and nonresident students, and by 19 percent of the Takoma Park students and 15 percent of the full-time students. Only seven percent of the total College respondents reported using all the other means of commuting combined: car pool, walking, bike or motorcycle, or being driven by a friend or family member. Ten percent of the Asian students were driven by a friend or family member, and seven percent of the nonresidents were walkers, the largest variations found.

Other Characteristics

Senior Citizen: Six per percent of the total College respondents were senior citizens. Thirty percent of the off-campus students indicated that they were senior citizens, the only group with a significantly larger percentage.

Living Alone: Thirteen percent of the total College respondents said they lived alone. Nonresidents had the largest percentage living alone (24%). Takoma Park, off-campus, evening and Asian students were somewhat more likely to be living alone than students in general.

Single Parent: Six percent of the total College respondents were single parents. Black students were the only group to differ significantly, with 13 percent saying they were single parents.

Parent of Young Children: Eighteen percent of the total College respondents were parents of young children. About one-fourth of the Germantown, off-campus, part-time, evening, and transfer students were parents of young children.

Veteran: Among total College respondents, seven percent were veterans. The students transferring 1-15 credits to the College had a considerably larger percentage of veterans (25%) than any other group.

Campus Differences: The greatest differences among the students by campus were found in the areas of employment, household income, and sources of money for college.

Germantown respondents were most likely to be working full-time, to be employed in professional or technical jobs, to have a household income of over $30,000, and to receive money for college from their employers.

Rockville respondents were less likely to be working full-time and more likely to be working part-time. They were less likely to have professional or technical jobs. Average household income was less than that of Germantown respondents and more than that of Takoma Park respondents. Rockville respondents were more likely to receive college support from parents or guardians, and less likely to receive it from employers than the Germantown students.

Takoma Park respondents were more likely to be unemployed. Of those who were employed, more worked full-time than part-time. Household incomes were more likely to be in the lowest two income categories (under $10,000 and under $20,000). They were more likely to be receiving financial aid and less likely than Rockville students to receive college support from parents and less likely than Germantown students to receive this support from employers.

Off-Campus students differed a great deal from on-campus students. They had more education and more worked full-time in professional or technical jobs. Household income was higher than that of Rockville and Takoma Park students, but lower than that of Germantown students. Employers were much more likely to be providing college support. In comparisons by campus of "Other Characteristics", the largest percentages of senior citizens, single parents, parents of young children, and veterans were found in the off-campus group.

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The Current Student Survey is one of five components of a Community Assessment Program study being conducted by the College's Office of Institutional Research. The purpose of the Current Student Survey is to find out from currently enrolled students their opinions on the quality of College programs, services and facilities; their perception and knowledge of the College; their educational goals and expectations; their preferences on class scheduling; their use of the media; and a number of demographic factors. The data will be used to determine how well the College is meeting the educational needs of its students and how to better communicate with them.

The reports on the Current Student Survey will be issued in several parts based on the following topics:

1. Student Evaluation of Montgomery College
2. Educational Goals and Reasons for Attending MC
3. Knowledge about Montgomery College
4. Media Use
5. Preferences on Class Scheduling
6. Demographics
7. Open-ended responses

It was thought important to find out if there are differences in the opinions and needs of several subgroups in the student population. Therefore, the data obtained will be analyzed so as to compare the responses of the following student groups: students enrolled at the different campuses and at off-campus locations; students attending in the day, evening and day/evening; students enrolled full-time and part-time; males and females; Asian, Black, and Hispanic students; students who have transferred to Montgomery College; and Montgomery County residents, Maryland residents, and nonresidents.

Methodology

In the fall semester of 1983, 20,314 students were enrolled in credit courses on all three campuses and at off-campus locations. All students were sent a questionnaire during the month of November, 1983, and those not responding were sent a follow-up questionnaire. Seven thousand two hundred and fifty-four (7,254) completed questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate of 35.7 percent of the student body (7254/20314).

Since no question on the questionnaire was answered by all respondents, the number (N) of student respondents will differ somewhat for each question. The total College N will not equal that of all students identified by campus, as about 200 respondents tore off the identifying label on the questionnaire. These are included only in the total College N.

Chi square was used to test the statistical significance of the difference among the groups. Two levels of confidence ($p < .01$ and $p < .05$) were established for the groups depending on size. A five percent difference between groups of students consisting of approximately 1,000 individuals or more, as in the case of students divided by campus, is statistically significant at the .01 level. This means that we can be fairly certain that a five percent difference found is not by chance, and that there is a real, however small difference between groups. Most of the comparisons done in this study are among groups of this size or larger. Thus, a five percent difference will be statistically significant for most comparisons.

Larger differences are needed to reach statistical significance when comparing smaller groups of students. Groups consisting of about 400 individuals in our study are Asians, Blacks, transfers, and off-campus students. For these comparisons, about a ten percent difference is needed to reach statistical significance at the .01 level of confidence and an eight percent difference for the .05 level of confidence. Even greater differences are necessary for smaller groups included here such as Hispanics, and nonresidents.

Differences reported as statistically significant may not always have practical significance. Practical significance, or the importance of the differences, is left to the judgment of the reader.

A Comparison of Questionnaire Respondents with All Fall 1983 Students

To ascertain the representativeness of the respondents to the total student body, comparisons of respondents and the total student population on key variables were made. Information on the total student population is taken from the OIR publication, titled, "Profile of Students Enrolled at MC during Fall Semester of 1983", and from internal records of the College. Comparison of the respondents and the fall 1983 student body on the variables of campus, full-time/part-time status, time of class attendance, residence and transfer status revealed no significant differences between groups. The percentage of respondents falling into these subgroups parallels that of the total student body. There were, however, some differences on age, sex, and minority status.

Age

Based on adjusted percentages, 62 percent of the respondents as compared to 70 percent of the fall 1983 student body were under 30 years of age. The respondents are a little older than the student body in general. The biggest discrepancy is in the 20-29 age group, which is underrepresented by five percent in our sample. This underrepresentation of younger students is similar for all campuses, and is a statistically significant difference.

Sex

Using adjusted percentages, the male student population is underrepresented in the respondents by five percent, a statistically significant difference.

Minority Status

The three groups that comprise our minority category, Asian, Black, and Hispanic students, were 15 percent of the respondents and 20 percent of the fall student body. It is primarily the Black students who are underrepresented, making up eight percent of the replies and eleven percent of the fall 1983 students.

Many students, both in the sample and in the total student population, could not be categorized by race or ethnicity. The "unknown" category is 19 percent of the sample and 17 percent of the fall 1983 student body. It is possible, of course, that some of the "unknowns" are minority students and that this group, in reality, is not underrepresented.

The minority respondents, like minorities in the total student body, are unevenly distributed among the campuses. Enrollment patterns of Black, Asian and Hispanic respondents by campus parallel that of these students in the fall 1983 student body. Sixty percent of the Black respondents were enrolled at Takoma Park, 33 percent at Rockville, and four percent at Germantown. Sixty percent of the Asian respondents were enrolled at Rockville, 30 percent at Takoma Park and three percent at Germantown. The enrollment of Hispanic respondents by campus differed slightly, but not significantly, from that of the Hispanic students enrolled in fall 1983. About two thirds of the Hispanic students were enrolled at Rockville and about one third were enrolled at Takoma Park in fall 1983. A slightly larger percentage of Hispanic survey respondents were enrolled at Rockville (68%) and a slightly smaller percentage were enrolled at the Takoma Park Campus (27%).

TABLE 1
Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students

		Respondents N = 7254			Fall 1983 Students N = 20314	
				Adj.*		
Campus		N	%	%	N	%
	Germantown	946	13	14	2397	12
	Rockville	4222	58	60	12369	61
	Takoma Park	1434	20	20	4291	21
	Off-Campus	451	6	6	1257	6
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Credits						
	Full-time	2005	28	28	6190	30
	Part-time	5048	70	72	14124	70
	Unknown	201	2	-		
	Total	7254	100	100%	20314	100%
Time						
	Day	3710	51	53	11061	54
	Evening	2383	33	34	6414	32
	Day/Eve	960	13	14	2839	14
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Residence						
	Montgomery Co.	6487	90	92	18424	91
	Maryland	251	3	4	819	4
	Nonresidents	315	4	4	1071	5
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%
Sex						
	Male	2758	38	39	9035	44
	Female	4295	59	61	11279	56
	Unknown	201	3	-		
	Total	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%

* Adjusted

TABLE 1 (Continued)
Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students

	Respondents N = 7254			Fall 1983 Students N = 20314		
	N	%	Adj. %	N	%	Adj. %
Age						
15-19 years	1296	18	19	4366	22	
20-29 years	2989	41	43	9808	48	
30-39 years	1322	18	19	3270	16	
40-49 years	633	9	9	1505	7	
50 and over	666	9	10	1365	7	
Unknown	348	5	-	-	-	
Total	7254	100	100	20314	100	
Race and Ethnicity						
Asian	443	6	7	1446	7	9
Black	460	6	8	1865	9	11
Hispanic	216	3	4	787	4	5
White	4654	64	79	12153	60	72
Other	138	2	2	510	3	3
Unknown	1343	19	-	3553	17	-
	7254	100%	100%	20314	100%	100%
Transfers						
1 - 15 credits	417	6		1033	5	
16 or more credits	478	7		1036	5	
	895	13%		2069	10	

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1 Comparison of Respondents and Fall 1983 Students 5

Summary Tables: Total College and All Student Groups

2 Highest Level of Education Completed. 9
3 Employment Status 9
4 Type of Work. 10
5 Household Income Before Taxes 11
6 Source of Money for College Education 11
7 Length of Time at Current Address 12
8 Residency within Commuting Distance of MC 12
9 How Students Commute to MC. 13
10 Other Characteristics of Students 13

Comparison by Campus

11 Amount of Education 17
12 Employment Status 17
13 Type of Work. 17
14 Household Income. 18
15 Sources of Money for College. 18
17 Time at Current Address 19
18 Residency within Commuting Distance of MC 19
19 How Students Commute to MC. 19

Statistically Significant Differences

20 Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students 21
21 Full-Time and Part-Time Students. 23
22 Asian, Black, Hispanic and and Nonminority Students. 25
23 Male and Female Students. 26
24 Montgomery County, Maryland and Nonresident Students. 27
25 Students Transferring Credits to MC 28

CURRENT STUDENT SURVEY REPORT

PART 5: DEMOGRAPHICS

OVERVIEW OF ALL QUESTIONS AND ALL GROUPS

The following tables summarize the demographic data obtained by questionnaire from the respondents. Nine questions were asked requesting information on amount of education, employment status, type of work, household income, means of paying college expenses, length of time at current address and within commuting distance of the College, means of commuting to the College, senior status, parental status, veteran status, and household size.

Comparisons of students by campus, full-time/part-time status, time of class attendance, minority/nonminority status, and residence revealed significant differences among these groups on almost every one of the above characteristics. Comparison of students by sex and by credits transferred revealed relatively fewer significant differences on these demographic characteristics.

The following information is presented in these summarized tables: each possible response to the question asked (some categories have been combined), percent of the total College respondents giving the response, the range of percentages of all student groups giving the response, and the names of student groups in which comparatively larger percentages of students gave the responses.

The student group listed first had the largest percentage (the top of the percentage range) giving the response. All groups listed are significantly different from the total College norm except in cases where the percentage range is very small. In cases where the percentage range is large, there are probably other significant differences. These are pointed out in the summaries of data for each student group. A great many significant differences were found, many of them already well documented in other reports about Montgomery College students.

TABLE 2
Highest Level of Education Completed

	Total College %	Range %	Students High in Percent Range
Less than high school diploma	1	0-3	Asian
High school diploma/GED	55	32-80	Full-time, Hispanic, Day/Evening
One year college certificate or A.A. degree	14	10-24	Transfers 16 credits or more
Bachelor's degree (4 years)	15	2-29	Off-Campus, Evening
Master's or Ph.D.	7	0-19	Off-Campus
Other	8	4-12	Transfers of 16 credits or more
	100		

(N=6946 = 96% TC)

TABLE 3
Employment Status

	Total College %	Range %	Students High in Percent Range
Employed full-time (more than 35 hrs. week)	43	7-83	Evening, Off-Campus, Part-time, Germantown
Employed part-time	32	8-59	Full-time, Day Day/Evening
Not employed	18	5-51	Nonresidents, Full-time, Asian, Hispanic
Full-time homemaker	7	*-12	Germantown, transfers of 16 credits or more
	100		

(N= 7117 = 98% TC)
*Less than one percent

TABLE 4
Type of Work

	Total College %	Range %	Students High in Percent Range
Professional or Technical	38	14-63	Off-Campus, Evening Transfers, Part-time
Salesperson or Clerical	25	15-36	Full-time, Female
Manager, Proprietor or Official	6	2-8	Germantown, Off-Campus
Service Worker	7	2-20	Asian, Full-time Nonresident
Laborer (except farm)	3	*-5	Full-time, Male Hispanic
Craftsman	2	1-3	Male, Hispanic
Operator	2	*-4	Black, Hispanic
Farm or Farm Worker	*	0-1	Germantown, Full-time
Other	17	10-23	Hispanic, Full-time, Day
	100		

(N = 5649 = 78% TC)
*Less than one percent

TABLE 5
Household Income Before Taxes

	Total College %	Range %	Students High in Percent Range
Less than $10,000	14	4-36	Asian, Hispanic Nonresident, Full-time
$10,000 - $19,999	25	18-32	Asian, Black, Hispanic, Takoma Park
$20,000 - $29,999	22	13-29	Off-Campus
$30,000 - $39,999	22	9-30	Germantown, Transfers
$40,000 or more	17	6-23	Germantown
	100		

(N = 4039 = 56% TC)

TABLE 6
Source of Money for College Education
(Students could check more than one response)

	Total College %	Range %	Students High in Percent Range
Self	61	42-75	Evening, Part-time
Parent/Guardian	26	3-56	Full-time, Non-residents, Day, Day/Evening
Employer	15	1-42	Off-Campus, Evening, MD, Germantown
Financial Aid	13	3-39	Asian, Black, Full-time, Hispanic
Spouse	9	1-14	Females, Transfers 16 credits or more
Other	6	3-17	Transfers 1-15 credits
All of the above	*	0-1	Asian

(N = 7061 = 97% TC)
*Less than one percent

TABLE 7
Length of Time at Current Address

	Total College %	Range %	Students High in Percent Range
Less than one year	15	12-36	Nonresidents, Hispanics, Asian
One to four years	33	28-60	Asian, Hispanic, Black, Evening
Five to ten years	19	7-26	Germantown
More than ten years	33	8-40	Day, Nonminority Full-time
	100		

(N = 4039 = 56% TC)

TABLE 8
Length of Residency Within Commuting Distance to MC

	Total College %	Range %	Students High in Percent Range
Less than one year	5	1-24	Hispanic, Asian Black
One to four years	22	16-60	Asian, Hispanic, Black
Five to ten years	19	11-25	Transfers, 16 or more credits, Germantown
More than ten years	54	8-63	Nonminority, day, Rockville
	100		

(N = 6719 = 93% TC)

TABLE 9
How Students Commute to MC

	Total College %	Range %	Students High in Percent Range
Drive self	84	56-95	Germantown, Evening Off-Campus, Transfers
Public transportation	9	1-32	Black, Nonresident Asian, Hispanic
Car pool	3	*-4	Rockville, Full-time Day
Driven by friend or family	2	*-10	Asian
Walk	2	0-7	Nonresidents
Bicycle or motorcycle	*	0-1	Full-time, Male, Day/ Evening, Black
	100		

(N = 6455 = 89% TC)
*Less than one percent

TABLE 10
Other Characteristics of Students
(Students could check more than one response)

	Total College %	Range %	Students High in Percent Range
Senior citizen	6	1-30	Off-Campus
Living alone	13	9-24	Nonresidents, Evening, Takoma Park Off-Campus, Asian
Single parent	6	2-13	Black
Parent of young children	18	5-28	Off-Campus, Transfers 16 credits or more, Germantown
Veteran	7	1-25	Transfers 1-15 credits, Male
None of the above	60	40-83	Full-time, day

(N = 7135 = 98% TC)

Explanation of "Other" Responses

A number of respondents explained their use of the "other" category in responding to the questions on amount of education, type of work, and sources of money for college.

"Other" Education: The "other" category was checked by 555 respondents. Two hundred fifty-five (46%) indicated that they had college credits or several years of education beyond high school but that they had earned no degrees. One hundred sixteen (21%) indicated specialized schooling, such as nursing, trade, business, art school, or education in the military. Fifty-three (9%) indicated having education equivalent to or more than a B.A. degree (2 B.A. degrees, post-graduate credits, more than a Master's degree). The remaining 131 respondents (24%) included some high school students as well as a number of undecipherable responses (Table 2).

"Other" Work: The "other" work category was checked by 972 respondents and 323 of these respondents wrote in the nature of their work. Categorization of these responses was difficult, but a rough picture of the nature of "other" work can be given. The largest proportion, about 40 percent, seemed to do some sort of service work, such as restaurant or hotel work, day care or teacher assistance, or security or police work. About 16 percent had semi-skilled or unskilled office or retailing jobs. About 12 percent were professionals, supervisors or managers. About eight percent were technicians and about seven percent had college work-study jobs. The remaining nine percent were self-employed or did such things as home improvement work (Table 4).

"Other" Source of Money for College: The "other" category was checked by 429 respondents and 138 explained their response. Over half of these respondents were either senior citizens or veterans and they cited the various government programs providing educational support. The rest of the responses were fairly evenly divided among the following sources of support: scholarships, loans, partial employer support, family trust funds or grandparents, vocational rehabilitation, disability benefits and Social Security survivor benefits (Table 6).

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA BY CAMPUS

The following summaries focus on the statistically significant differences found in our comparisons of students grouped by campus. The reader should refer to the accommpanying tables for the numerical data which was used in the comparisons.

Germantown Students

Compared to students enrolled at the other campuses, Germantown respondents differed significantly in the following ways:

More were full-time workers or homemakers and fewer were part-time workers or unemployed (Table 12).

More had professional, technical or managerial jobs and fewer were service workers (Table 13).

More were in the two highest household income categories ($30,000 and $40,000 or more) and fewer were in the lowest income category (Table 14).

More cited employers or spouse as a source of money for College and fewer cited financial aid as a source (Table 15).

More had lived at their current address, and within commuting distance of the College for five to ten years (Table 17 and 18). More drove themselves to the College (Table 19).

More were parents of young children (Table 16).

Rockville Students

Compared to students enrolled at the other campuses, Rockville respondents differed significantly in the following ways:

More had a high school diploma or GED as their highest level of education (Table 11).

Fewer were full-time workers and more were part-time workers (Table 12).

Fewer were employed in professional or technical jobs (Table 13).

Household income was less than that of Germantown students and more than that of Takoma Park students (Table 14).

More parents or guardians were sources of money for College (Table 15).

More had lived at their current address and within commuting distance of the College for ten or more years (Table 17 and 18).

A larger percentage checked "None of the Above" with regard to other characteristics that might apply (being a "senior citizen" etc.), (Table 16).

Takoma Park Students

Compared to students enrolled at the other campuses, Takoma Park respondents differed significantly in the following ways:

More were unemployed (Table 12).

More were in the lowest two categories of household income and fewer were in the highest two categories (Table 14).

More cited financial aid as a source of College money and fewer cited parent or guardian as a source (Table 15).

More had lived at their current address and within commuting distance of the College for a shorter period of time (Tables 17 and 18).

More used public transportation to commute to the College (Table 19).

More Takoma Park respondents were living alone (Table 16).

Off-Campus Students

Compared to the on-campus students, those enrolled at off-campus locations differed significantly in the following ways:

More had completed more years of education. Forty-eight percent had a Bachelor's, Master's, or Doctoral degree (Table 11).

Many more worked full-time (Table 12).

A much larger percent held professional or technical jobs (Table 13).

Few were in the lowest income group. Average household income was higher than that of Takoma Park and Rockville students, but lower than that of Germantown students (Table 14).

A much larger percentage indicated employer as a source of College money. Few cited parent or guardian or financial aid as a source (Table 15).

Most drove themselves to classes and very few used public transportation, a pattern similar to that of the Germantown students (Table 19).

Many more were "Senior Citizens". For all the characteristics listed (senior citizen, living alone, single parent, parent of young children, veteran), the largest percentage was found in the off-campus student group. However, each difference is not great enough to reach statistical significance (Table 16).

TABLE 11
Amount of Education

	Total College		German-town	Rock-ville	Takoma Park	Off-Campus
			N = 924	4104	1399	434
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Less than High School	82	1	1	1	1	1
High School Diploma/GED	3853	55	53	60	53	32
One Year College Certificate	526	8	6	8	8	4
AA	420	6	8	6	6	6
Bachelors	1025	15	16	13	14	29
Masters	403	6	7	4	7	13
Doctorate	82	1	1	1	1	6
Other	555	8	8	7	10	9
Total	6946	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 12
Employment Status

	Total College		German-town	Rock-ville	Takoma Park	Off-Campus
			N = 932	4214	1434	453
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Full-time	3055	43	53	37	41	78
Part-time	2285	32	24	37	30	11
Not Employed	1294	18	11	20	23	6
Homemaker	483	7	12	6	6	5
Total	7117	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 13
Type of Work

	Total College		German-town	Rock-ville	Takoma Park	Off-Campus
			N = 764	3307	1094	416
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Prof. Tech.	2165	38	44	34	38	63
Sales, Clerical	1386	25	25	26	23	16
Manager	321	6	8	6	4	8
Farmer	13	*	1	*	0	0
Craftsman	103	2	1	2	1	1
Operator	122	2	1	2	3	*
Laborer	157	3	2	3	3	*
Service Worker	410	7	4	8	9	2
Other	972	17	14	19	19	10
Total	5649	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Less than one percent

TABLE 14
Household Income Before Taxes

	Total College		German-town N = 577	Rock-ville 2228	Takoma Park 1399	Off-Campus 434
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Less than $10,000	554	14	6	14	21	4
$10,000 - $19,999	992	25	18	24	30	22
$20,000 - 29,999	919	22	23	23	21	29
$30,000 - 39,999	913	22	30	23	16	25
$40,000 and above	661	17	23	16	12	20
Total	4039	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 15
Sources of Money for College**

	N=7061 Total College		German-town N = 946	Rock-ville 4222	Takoma Park 1434	Off-Campus 448
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Self	4384	61	63	59	63	62
Parent/Guardian	1848	26	17	33	17	3
Employer	1056	15	23	11	11	42
Spouse	622	9	13	8	8	5
Financial Aid	913	13	7	12	22	3
All of the above	9	*	0	*	*	0
Other	429	6	6	6	7	6

TABLE 16
Other Characteristics**

	N=7135 Total College		German-town N = 764	Rock-ville 3307	Takoma Park 1094	Off-Campus 416
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Senior citizen	437	6	5	5	9	30
Living alone	940	13	11	11	18	18
Single parent	399	6	6	4	8	9
Parent of young children	1265	18	26	14	19	28
Veteran	526	7	9	7	6	11
None of the above	4264	60	53	65	51	40

* Less than one percent
**Students could check more than one response

TABLE 17
Time at Current Address

	Total College		Germantown N = 899	Rockville 4016	Takoma Park 1355	Off-Campus 427
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Less than one year	1021	15	16	14	19	13
One to four years	2266	33	35	31	39	35
Five to ten years	1271	19	26	18	14	21
More than ten years	2224	33	23	37	28	31
Total	6782	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 18
Residency Within Commuting Distance Of MC

	Total College		Germantown N = 897	Rockville 3785	Takoma Park 1330	Off-Campus 422
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Less than one year	337	5	5	4	8	4
One to four years	1490	22	22	20	31	17
Five to ten years	1273	19	24	18	17	22
More than ten years	3619	54	49	58	44	57
	6719	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

TABLE 19
How Students Commute to MC

	Total College		Germantown N = 855	Rockville 3811	Takoma Park 1263	Off-Campus 407
	N	%	%	%	%	%
Drive self	5409	84	95	84	73	92
Car pool	179	3	2	4	1	2
Driven by friend or family	152	2	2	3	2	1
Public transportation	554	9	1	7	19	1
Walk	138	2	0	2	5	4
Bike or motorcycle	23	*	*	*	*	*
	6455	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Less than one percent

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES AMONG STUDENT GROUPS

Because so much demographic data is already available on students, the following summaries omit all but the items on which statistically significant differences were found. For instance, in Table 20, the data on "Education" for which there were six educational level categories (see Table 2), includes only those categories on which day, evening, and day/evening students differed significantly. This will be true of all the characteristics included in Tables 20-25. The text accompanying each table focuses only on the differences which the researchers believed to be of greater interest.

Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students: Significant Differences

Thirty-seven percent of the evening students had a bachelor's, master's or doctoral degree as compared to 15 percent of the day students and 10 percent of the day/evening students. Over half of the evening students were employed in professional or technical jobs as compared to 25 percent of the day students and 32 percent of the day/evening students.

Few of the evening students were in the lowest income group as compared to 19 percent of the day students and 20 percent of the day/evening students. Nearly one-third of the evening students received employer support versus 10 percent or less for the other two student groups.

Approximately one-fourth of the day and day-evening students were unemployed versus only five percent of the evening student who were unemployed. Day and day/evening students were more frequent recipients of financial aid than evening students.

TABLE 20
Day, Evening and Day/Evening Students: Significant Differences

		Day %	Evening %	Day/Evening %
Education:	High school diploma/GED	64	39	66
	bachelors, masters, doctoral	15	37	10
Employment:	Full-time (35 hrs. or more per week)	20	83	32
	Part-time	45	8	41
	Not employed	26	5	23
Type Work:	Professional or technical	25	57	32
	Sales or clerical	28	19	27
	Service worker	11	3	8
Household Income:	Less than $10,000	19	5	21
	$10,000 - $19,999	20	29	26
	$20,000 - $29,000	21	26	21
	$30,000 - $39,000	22	23	23
	$40,000 and above	18	17	9
Source of College Money:	Self	55	75	61
	Parent/guardian	37	6	34
	Employer	6	31	10
	Financial aid	17	4	23
Time at Current Address:	More than 10 years	40	23	31
Commute by:	Drive self	78	93	83
	Public transportation	12	3	10
Other Characteristics:	Living alone	10	19	15
	Parent of young children	15	23	18
	Veteran	5	11	9

Full-Time vs. Part-Time Students: Significant Differences

Most full-time students had no more than a high school diploma. Very few worked full-time but over half worked part-time. One third were not employed. Over half reported a household income of less than $20,000 and 28 percent reported an income of less than $10,000. Over half received financial support for College from parent or guardian and 27 percent received financial aid.

In comparison, approximately half of the part-time students a high school diploma and 30 percent had a bachelor's, master's or doctoral degree. Only twelve percent were not employed. Almost half held professional or technical jobs. Only nine percent reported a household income of less than $10,000. Employers provided financial support for College for 21 percent of the part-time students. Relatively few received such support from parents or from financial aid.

TABLE 21
Full-Time and Part-Time Students: Significant Differences

		Full-Time	Part-Time
		%	%
Education:	High school diploma/GED	80	46
	bachelors, masters, doctoral	2	30
Employment:	Full-time (35 hrs. or more per week)	7	58
	Part-time	59	21
	Not employed	33	12
Type Work:	Professional or Technical	14	46
	Sales or clerical	36	21
	Service worker	14	5
Household Income:	Less than $10,000	28	9
	$10,000 - $19,999	23	25
	$20,000 - $29,000	17	24
	$30,000 - $39,000	18	24
	$40,000 and above	14	18
Source of College Money:	Self	46	70
	Parent/guardian	56	14
	Employer	1	21
	Financial aid	27	7
Commute to MC by:	Drive self	74	88
	Public transportation	15	6
Other Characteristics:	Senior citizen	1	9
	Living alone	9	15
	Parent of young children	5	24

Asian, Black, Hispanic and Nonminority Students: Significant Differences

Asian students paralleled nonminority students in the amount of education completed, while fewer Black and Hispanic students had more than a high school diploma/GED.

More minority students were unemployed and fewer Asian and Hispanic students (but not Black students) worked full-time.

Much larger percentages of minority students were in the lowest income categories. Sixty-eight percent of the Asian students, 60 percent of the Hispanic students, and 56 percent of the Black students had household incomes of less than $20,000. Thirty-three percent of the nonminority students had incomes this low.

Much larger percentages of minority students had financial aid as a source of College money. Thirty-nine percent of the Asian students cited this source. Fewer Black students and more Hispanic students cited parents as a source of College money. Fewer minority students cited employer as a source than did nonminority students. More Black students were single parents.

Significantly more minority students had lived at their current address fewer years than had nonminority students. Minority students were much more likely to use public transportion to commute to the College than were nonminority students.

TABLE 22
Asian, Black, Hispanic and Nonminority Students: Significant Differences

		Asian	Black	Hispanic	Non-Minority
		%	%	%	%
Education:	High school diploma/GED	54	63	69	54
	bachelors, masters, doctoral	23	9	5	23
Employment:	Full-time (35 hrs. or more per week)	26	48	33	45
	Part-time	39	27	31	31
	Not employed	31	22	30	16
Type Work:	Professional, technical	31	35	25	40
	Service worker	20	7	10	6
Household Income:	Less than $10,000	36	25	30	10
	$10,000 - $19,999	32	31	30	23
	$20,000 - $29,000	13	22	21	24
	$30,000 - $39,000	13	13	12	25
	$40,000 and above	6	9	7	18
Source of College Money:	Self	44	63	46	66
	Parent/guardian	22	18	32	26
	Employer	7	12	6	17
	Financial aid	39	29	24	9
Time at Current Address:	Less than one year	21	16	24	12
	One to four years	60	48	50	29
	More than four years	19	36	26	59
Commute to MC by:	Drive self	59	60	67	89
	Public transportation	26	32	22	4
Other Characteristics:	Single parent	3	13	5	5

Male and Female Students: Significant Differences

There were few significant differences between male and female students. This lack of difference is perhaps more interesting than the few differences none of which were very large, that did reach statistical significance.

TABLE 23
Male and Female Students

		Male %	Female %
Type of Work:	Sales and clerical	15	32
Employment:	Full-time (35 hours. weekly)	47	41
	Unemployed	20	17
	Homemaker	*	11
Source of College Money:	Parent/guardian	30	24
	Spouse	1	14
Other Characteristics:	Single parent	2	8
	Parent of young children	14	21
	Veteran	17	1

Montgomery County, Maryland and Nonresidents: Significant Differences

Perhaps the most interesting findings regarding Maryland residents are the large proportions who report their employer and financial aid as a source of College money.

The nonresidents differed from the Montgomery County and Maryland residents in a number of ways. Half of the nonresidents were unemployed versus 14 percent of the County residents and 17 percent of the Maryland residents. Approximately twice the percentage of nonresidents were in the lowest income category and received parental support.

Thirty-six percent of the nonresidents had lived at their current address for less than a year as compared to 14 percent of the County residents and 16 percent of the Maryland residents. Approximately twice the percentage of nonresidents were living alone.

TABLE 24
Montgomery County, Maryland and Nonresidents

		MC %	MD %	Nonresidents %
Education:	High school diploma/GED	56	61	64
	bachelors, masters, doctoral	22	14	14
Employment:	Full-time (35 hrs. or more per week)	45	48	27
	Part-time	34	33	20
	Not employed	14	17	51
Household Income:	Less than $10,000	13	16	29
	$10,000 - $19,999	24	27	28
	$20,000 - $29,000	23	20	21
	$30,000 - $39,000	24	21	9
	$40,000 and above	16	16	13
Source of College Money:	Self	64	44	42
	Parent/guardian	25	26	51
	Employer	15	31	10
	Financial aid	13	23	13
Time at Current Address:	Less than one year	14	16	36
	Five to ten years	19	20	7
Commute to MC by:	Drive self	86	80	56
	Public transportation	7	13	32
Other Characteristics:	Living alone	13	12	24
	Parent of young children	19	22	6

Students Transferring Credits to MC: Significant Differences

Many of the students who had transfered 16 or more credits to Montgomery College had, in fact, many more than 16 credits, with 28 percent possessing a Bachelor's degree or higher. Almost half of all transfers held professional or technical jobs. Household income, however, did not differ from that of the general student population. Perhaps the most interesting finding regarding transfers is the large proportion of veterans in this group.

TABLE 25
Students Transferring Credits to MC

		1-15	16 or more	Total College
		%	%	%
Education:	High school diploma/GED	63	36	55
	bachelors, masters, doctoral	8	28	19
Employment:	Full-time (35 hrs. or more per week)	48	51	43
Type of Work:	Professional or technical	45	51	38
Source of College Money:	Parent/guardian	23	14	26
Other Characteristics:	Parent of young children	25	28	18
	Veteran	25	16	7

MONTGOMERY COLLEGE
Current Student Survey
1983-1984

(Please make corrections if necessary.)

Place address label here.

____
(Name)
____
(Address)
____

Dear Montgomery College Student:

I sincerely hope that you are finding your experience at Montgomery College pleasant and rewarding.

As a student enrolled at Montgomery College in the 1983–1984 academic year, you are a necessary part of the Current Student Survey being conducted to help the College assess its programs and services so that it may better serve you and others like yourself.

Please complete the following survey and return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. All responses will be kept confidential. Your assistance in this survey is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Robert E. Parilla

Robert E. Parilla
President

---

(032) 1. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
1 ___ Less than high school diploma
2 ___ High school diploma/GED
3 ___ One-year college certificate
4 ___ Associate degree
5. ___ Bachelor's degree (four years)
6. ___ Master's degree
7 ___ Doctoral degree
8 ___ Other, specify: _______________

(033-042) 2. Why did you choose Montgomery College? (Check all that apply)
1 ___ Low tuition
2 ___ Convenient location
3 ___ Offers desired programs
4 ___ Reputation of college
5 ___ Recommended by friend
6 ___ Reputation of faculty
7 ___ Recommended by family members
8 ___ Recommended by high school teacher/counselor
9 ___ Other, specify: _______________
10 ___ All of the above

(043) 3. What is your goal while attending Montgomery College?

1 ___ Complete desired courses, not earn a degree or certificate
2 ___ Earn a certificate
3 ___ Earn the associate degree

(044) 4. How long do you anticipate it will take you to achieve your goal at Montgomery College?

1 ___ One semester
2 ___ Two semesters
3 ___ Three semesters
4 ___ Four semesters
5. ___ Five semesters
6. ___ Six or more semesters
7. ___ Do not know

(045) 5. What is your primary reason for attending Montgomery College?

1 ___ Explore new academic or career areas
2 ___ Preparation for immediate entry into a career
3 ___ Preparation for transfer to a four-year institution
4 ___ Update skills for career advancement
5 ___ Interest and self enrichment
6 ___ Other

How would you rate the following college activities and facilities? If you rate an item as poor, please state reason below.

Quality of Services

		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No knowledge/ No opinion
(046)	6. Quality of Instruction	1 ___	2. ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(047)	7. Course availability	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(048)	8. Availability of instructors	1 ___	2. ___	3. ___	4 ___	5 ___
(049)	9 Helpfulness of instructors in completing a course	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4 ___	5 ___
(050)	10. Courtesy of administrators and staff	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4 ___	5 ___
(051)	11. Courtesy of instructors	1 ___	2. ___	3. ___	4 ___	5 ___
(052)	12. Assessment testing	1 ___	2. ___	3. ___	4 ___	5 ___
(053)	13. Counseling/advising	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4 ___	5 ___
(054)	14. Admission application processing (Admissions)	1 ___	2. ___	3. ___	4 ___	5 ___
(055)	15. Processing course requests (Registration)	1 ___	2. ___	3. ___	4 ___	5. ___
(056)	16. Cashier processing of tuition/fee payments	1 ___	2. ___	3. ___	4 ___	5 ___
(057)	17 Student financial aid	1 ___	2. ___	3. ___	4 ___	5 ___
(058)	18. Job placement assistance	1 ___	2. ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(059)	19. Reading, writing, and language skills improvement programs	1 ___	2. ___	3 ___	4 ___	5. ___
(060)	20. Math skills improvement program	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(061)	21 Library services	1 ___	2. ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___

Quality of Conditions of Physical Facilities

		Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No knowledge/ No opinion
(062)	22. Laboratory	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(063)	23. Child care center	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(064)	24. Classroom	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(065)	25. Cafeteria	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(066)	26. Athletic	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(067)	27. Security	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(068)	28. Social/recreation (game room, lounges, etc.)	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(069)	29. Library	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(070)	30. Bookstore	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(071)	31. Parking lot (space availability)	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(072)	32. Math skills center	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___
(073)	33. Reading and writing center	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___	5 ___

Reasons for poor ratings: ____

____

____

____

How would you rate the following College goals?

		Very important	Important	Not important	Undecided
(074)	34. Provide students with appropriate and essential education and training beyond high school	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(075)	35. Provide an environment to encourage life long learning	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(076)	36. Provide students with specific skills in career and transfer programs	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(077)	37. Provide assessment testing	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(078)	38. Provide courses and programs for updating job skills	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(079)	39. Provide courses and programs for retraining or new careers	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(080)	40. Provide quality programs and services	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(081)	41. Provide academic and career counseling	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(082)	42. Provide handicapped student services	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(083)	43. Provide review courses	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(084)	44. Maintain an open-door admissions policy	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___
(085)	45. Maintain low tuition and fees	1 ___	2 ___	3 ___	4 ___

(086) 46. How would you, in general, assess the difficulty of your course work?
1 ___ Harder than I expected
2 ___ About what I expected
3 ___ Easier than I expected

(087) 47. Have the final grades you received accurately reflected your knowledge and performance in your course work?
1 ___ Yes
2 ___ No
3 ___ No final grades received

(088) 48. At what time is it most convenient for you to attend class?
1. ___ Morning
2. ___ Afternoon
3. ___ Evening
4. ___ Weekend

(089) 49. At what time(s) can't you attend class?
1 ___ Morning
2 ___ Afternoon
3. ___ Evening
4 ___ Weekend

(090) 50. For a typical 3-credit course, would you prefer to meet:
1 ___ Once a week for a 3 hour session for 15 weeks
2 ___ Twice a week for 1½ hours each session for 15 weeks
3 ___ Three times a week for 1 hour each session for 15 weeks
4 ___ Twice a week for a 3 hour session for 8 weeks
5 ___ Once a week for a 6 hour session for 8 weeks

(091) 51. Have you ever taken a college course through the television media?
1 ___ Yes
2. ___ No

(092) 52. Would you like to take a course via TV or cable?
1 ___ Yes
2. ___ No

(093–099) 53. How is your college education being paid for? (Please check all that apply)
1 ___ Self
2. ___ Parent/guardian
3. ___ Employer
4 ___ Spouse
5 ___ Financial Aid
6. ___ All of the above
7. ___ Other, please specify: ______________________
____

(100) 54. How do you commute to the College?
1 ___ Drive self
2 ___ Car pool
3 ___ Driven by family member or friend
4. ___ Public transportation
5. ___ Walk
6. ___ Bicycle or motorcycle

(101) 55. What radio station do you most frequently listen to?
1 ___ WASH
2 ___ WGAY
3 ___ WINX
4 ___ WJOK
5. ___ WKYS
6. ___ WMAL
7 ___ WTOP
8 ___ Other: ______________________

(102) 56. When?
1 ___ Morning
2 ___ Afternoon
3. ___ Evening

(103) 57. What television channel do you most frequently watch?
1. ___ 4 (WRC)
2. ___ 5 (WTTG)
3. ___ 7 (WJLA)
4. ___ 9 (WDVM)
5. ___ 26 (WETA)
6. ___ Other, specify: ______________________

(104) 58. When?
1. ___ Morning
2. ___ Afternoon
3. ___ Evening

(105) 59. What is your employment status?
1. ___ Employed full-time (more than 35 hours per week)
2. ___ Employed part-time
3. ___ Not employed
4. ___ Full-time homemaker

(106) 60. If employed, which of the following best describes your type of work?
1. ___ Professional or technical
2. ___ Sales worker or clerical
3. ___ Manager, proprietor or official
4. ___ Farmer or farm worker
5. ___ Craftsman
6. ___ Operator
7. ___ Laborer (except farm)
8. ___ Service worker
9. ___ Other, please explain: ______________________

(107-112) 61. In addition to being a student, please check all of the following categories that may apply to you.
1. ___ Senior citizen
2. ___ Living alone
3. ___ Single parent
4. ___ Parent of young children
5. ___ Veteran
6. ___ None of the above

Please indicate whether or not you knew the following about the College and if you feel it is a positive or negative attribute for the College?

		Know it		Feel it is	
		Yes	No	Positive	Negative
(113-114)	62. It has three campuses.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(115-116)	63. You can complete the A.A. degree requirements for some programs through evening study.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(117-118)	64. It is the only public institution of higher education headquartered in the County.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(119-120)	65. It provides academic and career counseling services.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(121-122)	66. It provides support services for the handicapped student.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(123-124)	67. Sixty-nine percent of its students are part-time.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(125-126)	68. Over 85 percent of its graduates are employed.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(127-128)	69. Over 50 percent of its graduates transfer to upper division schools.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(129-130)	70. Over 40,000 students attend each year in credit and non-credit courses.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(131-132)	71. The library on each campus is open on the weekend.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(133-134)	72. The recreation facilities on each campus are open to all students.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___
(135-136)	73. It has a student activities program.	1. ___	2. ___	3. ___	4. ___

(137) 74. Do you believe students need photo I.D. cards?

1 ____ Yes
2 ____ No

(138) 75. If you answered "yes" to the above question, would you be willing to pay a small service charge for this card?

1 ____ Yes
2. ____ No

(139) 76. How long have you lived at your current address?

1 ____ Less than 1 year
2. ____ 1–4 years
3. ____ 5–10 years
4. ____ More than 10 years

(140) 77. How long have you lived within commuting distance of Montgomery College?

1 ____ Less than 1 year
2 ____ 1–4 years
3. ____ 5–10 years
4. ____ More than 10 years

(141) 78. What is the approximate income of your household before taxes?

1 ____ Less than $5,000
2 ____ $5,000–$9,999
3 ____ $10,000–$14,999
4 ____ $15,000–$19,999
5 ____ $20,000–$24,999
6 ____ $25,000–$29,999
7. ____ $30,000–$34,999
8. ____ $35,000–$39,999
9. ____ $40,000–$49,999
10. ____ $50,000 and over
11. ____ Don't know

(142) 79. Do the College catalog descriptions accurately reflect the subjects taught in courses you have taken?

1 ____ Yes
2. ____ No

If "no", please explain: ________________________________

____

____

(143) 80. Did you find the class schedule for the current semester to be a highly usable publication?

1 ____ Yes
2. ____ No

If "no", how can it be improved? ________________________

____

____

81 What program or service not already offered at the College would you like to have available?

Please specify: ____

____

____

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.

238

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
SEP 13 1985